

SOVIET SOCIOLOGY:

1960 - 1963

Elizabeth Ann Weinberg

Research Program on Problems of International
Communication and Security

Center for International Studies
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts
October 1, 1964

The research was sponsored by the Advanced Research Projects
Agency of the Department of Defense (ARPA) under contract
#920F-9717 and monitored by the Air Force Office of Scientific
Research (AFOSR) under contract AF 49(638)-1237.

DISCLAIMER NOTICE

THIS DOCUMENT IS THE BEST
QUALITY AVAILABLE.

COPY FURNISHED CONTAINED
A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF
PAGES WHICH DO NOT
REPRODUCE LEGIBLY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page</u>
	Preface	1
I	The Theories Behind Soviet Sociology	2
II	The Sociologist and his Work	16
III	Research Theory	29
IV	Public Opinion Polls	35
V	Time Use Studies	48
VI	Conclusions	74
	Annotated Bibliography	77
	Additional Bibliography	88a
	Bibliography for Stratification	89
	Appendices:	
	I. The Soviet Delegates - Their Writing	92
	II. Public Opinion Questions	97
	III. Time Budget Blank for Workers and Office Workers	101
	IV. Distribution of Time - Sample Time Budgets	105

Preface

This essay attempts to investigate and analyze the theoretical and empirical components of contemporary Soviet sociology. The theoretical aspects, presented from the Soviet viewpoint, are viewed mainly with the purpose of understanding what the Soviets actually profess to believe and on what they base their studies; no attempt has been made to criticize their general theory. The empirical examination, however, consists both of description and criticism. In both areas I have tried to show chronological development and change.

Although it is here viewed critically through the eyes of a Western sociologist, Soviet sociology is not compared with Western or "bourgeois" sociology. Nor is it compared with sociology in other socialist countries.

The researcher in Soviet sociology is handicapped by the fact that, since there is not one Soviet journal dedicated to sociology, his material must be searched for in philosophical, historical, economic, ethnographic, anthropological, and juridical journals. For this study, any journal that contained a sociological article was thoroughly combed for similar articles for the years 1960 to 1963. A good portion of the significant articles have been translated by the Current Digest of the Soviet Press, Soviet Sociology, or Joint Publications Research Service.

BLANK PAGE

THE THEORIES BEHIND SOVIET SOCIOLOGY

As Soviet thought essentially proceeds from the general to the specific, so an examination of their sociology in the 1960's must follow the same pattern. We must trace the special theory and philosophy of Soviet sociology, its connection with other areas of study, and the attitudes it expresses toward bourgeois sociology. From there we may delve into the function of the scientist, the social scientist, and finally, the sociologist.

For some time there has been an argument in the Soviet Union about present-day sociology and historical materialism. Some scholars say that they are one and the same thing, that historical materialism is Marxist sociology. Others think that historical materialism, being a component part of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, cannot at the same time be some kind of special non-philosophical science independent of dialectical materialism--i.e., Marxist sociology. In a word, historical materialism constitutes the philosophical and theoretical foundation of scientific sociology. The third group assumes that historical materialism is a component of Marxist philosophy and so, at the same time, is Marxist sociology.¹ Thus the first view assumes that sociology as a separate science is unnecessary. The second maintains that historical materialism is the theoretical foundation for sociology, but sociologists per se may do social research or empirical research. The third assumes that philosophy is the field from which historical materialism and sociology stem.

¹U.S. Fen summarizes these arguments in Voprosi Marksistskoi Sotsiologii: Trudy Sotsiologicheskovo Seminara, edited by V.F. Rozhin (Leningrad: Izdatelstvo Leningradskovo Universiteta, 1962), pp. 19 ff.

Bukharin, upholding the initial view, was perhaps the first to state that the working class had its own proletarian sociology known as historical materialism. By 1961 Bukharin's stand--that since historical materialism and Marxist sociology are synonymous, there is no basis for separating the "laws of historical materialism" and "sociological laws"--had many adherents. But by 1962, although the second view took precedence in sociological literature, proclaiming that historical materialism as well as dialectical materialism is the philosophical and methodological basis for scientific sociology,² the third view was voiced and supported.

Placing this dispute in the background, we may say that within the Soviet framework the historical materialistic theory of sociology is regarded and accepted as the only valid explanation of the nature of social phenomena, the sequence of their development, and their role in the social process.³ Historical materialism is the science which studies the most general laws in the development of society and gives the theoretical basis and scientific method for understanding concrete, historical conditions. In other words, whether historical materialism is sociology or the basis of sociology or philosophy plus sociology, its laws and categories are used for sociological theory and concrete research; i.e. it is the official framework with which no "concrete" or theoretical sociology may conflict. While imposing a "rigidly controlled doctrinal orientation

²For further discussion, see George Fischer, Science and Politics: The New Sociology in the Soviet Union (Ithaca, New York: Center for International Studies, Cornell University, 1964).

³Rozhin, op.cit. pp. 15-16.

designed to make investigations strictly instrumental in helping to improve economic performance and social control, and while rendering these investigations ideologically innocuous and therefore politically safe," the party is trying to avoid any corrosive action on the purity of the doctrine.⁴

Sociology, in Soviet theory, is also linked with history. Since sociology explains the general laws of human evolution and society, it serves as a method for history. Sociology formulates a definite point of view and provides a means of investigation; history, in its turn, furnishes the material for drawing sociological conclusions and making sociological generalizations. While the underlying principles of the Marxist researchers in both sociology and history are identical, the method of investigation differs on account of the time element. For concrete sociological research, the concept "historical situation" has significance in that it insures that the whole aggregate of acting forces relevant to a given situation is considered.⁵

As far as the field of philosophy is concerned, sociology is as closely linked to it as to any other field. This is partly explained by the fact that philosophy concentrates on such subjects as historical and dialectical materialism, but also by the fact that the duty of Soviet philosophy today is to give scientific answers to questions

⁴Leopold Labedz, "Sociology as a Vocation," Survey: A Journal of Soviet and East European Studies, No. 48 (July, 1963), p. 61.

⁵G. Osipov and M. Kovchuck, "Some Principles of Theory Problems and Methods of Research in Sociology in the USSR," Paper read at the Fifth World Congress of Sociology in Washington, D.C., 1962 in American Sociological Review, XXVIII, No. 4 (August, 1963), p. 622.

which are set forth in this epoch of building communism. This means that sociologists and philosophers are examining the same subject (i.e., the role of labor, the problem of communist morals, the role of the collective in communist education--basically the transition from socialism to communism) and partly explains why philosophers double in the role of sociologist. In reality sociologists are educated as philosophers and become sociologists by doing "sociological research". (See below.)

In practice Soviet philosophers, as sociologists, are almost as concerned with bourgeois sociology as they are with Marxist theory and research. They devote much of their writing today to sociology as it is practiced in the West. This selection of the theoretical examination of Soviet sociology therefore describes the Soviet view of theoretical and empirical "bourgeois" sociology.

The most obvious and basic criticism of bourgeois sociology is its class character. The Marxists maintain that the social sciences, like every other field of study, have a class character. Each class has its own practice, its special tasks, its interests, and therefore its view of things. In the final analysis the contrast between Marxist sociological principles and bourgeois sociological principles rests on the different objectives and interests of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. When the bourgeoisie is the ruling class, it must solve a great number of questions (e.g., how to maintain capitalism). Thus the bourgeoisie needs the social sciences to help it adapt to social life and to choose a course in the solution of practical problems. "Modern bourgeois sociology is nothing more than a mechanical aggregate of different social myths and utopias which express the age-old dream of a class peace, social integration, solidarity, harmony, etc.

while preserving private ownership of the goods and means of production and, consequently, the exploitation of man by man.⁶ Social phenomena are therefore understood only on the basis of the society's class structure.

The second objection Soviet sociologists have to bourgeois sociology is its use of theory. First of all, Marxist sociology as a general theoretical science of society views concrete sociological studies as a means of solving problems facing society; bourgeois sociology, however, aims at "curing individual ills" of the capitalist society, while it completely ignores the general social process of which these ills are merely particular manifestations.⁷ Marxist sociology of dialectic and materialism and bourgeois sociology of metaphysics and idealism also differ basically in applying their principles to the understanding of society. Moreover, Soviet criticism refers to the bourgeois sociologist's denial of the significance of general sociological theory; it affirms that, since modern bourgeois sociology questions the existence of general laws governing the development of human society and the possibility of knowing these laws,⁸ in bourgeois sociology theory would not determine the objectives and interpretations of sociological research as it ideally does for the Soviets. The connection with theory

⁶G.V. Osipov et al., Nauchnie Doklady Vysshei Shkoly: Filosofskie Nauki, No. 5, p. 2.

⁷G.V. Osipov, "Some Characteristics and Features of 20th Century Bourgeois Sociology," Voprosy Filosofii, No. 8 (1962), translated in The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, XIV, No. 42 (1962), p. 11.

⁸Ervand Pogosyan, "Social and Cultural Problems in Contemporary Neo-Freudianism," Vestnik Istorii Mirovoy Kultury, No. 3 (1961), translated in The Soviet Review, LXI, No. 4 (1962), p. 17.

has not been the conditioning feature of bourgeois sociology; hence the complaint.

The third aspect which the Soviets vociferously denounce is the linking of bourgeois sociology with social psychology and with the theory of the social group, a connection which, they complain, dissolves sociological problems into psychological problems--for then sociology has become social psychology. In such an approach, they continue, the objective logic of social development is overlooked, and the real nature of the capitalist society remains hidden behind a facade of psychic interaction between people--behind the web of individual human relations, acts, and intentions.⁹ Social psychology becomes the main methodological principle and converts sociology into a theory of behavior, leading towards a realm of the subjective rather than the objective. Hence contemporary psychologism in bourgeois sociology is the theoretical basis for inculcating stereotyped views and standard norms of behavior.¹⁰ By equating the concept of "social situation" with the concept of the "social-psychological," "purely ideal" phenomena are analyzed without regard to their dependence on and conditioning by material factors.¹¹ The Soviet criticism of the social group theory in bourgeois sociology stems from the fact that bourgeois sociology

⁹ I.M. Popova, "Social Psychology in American Sociology," Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta, Seriya Ekonomiki, Filosofii i Prava, No. 5 (1960), translated in The Soviet Review, II, No. 8 (1961), p. 6.

¹⁰ This is the conclusion Popova comes to in his article "K Voprosu o Sotsialnoi Pochve Psikhologizma V Burzhuaznoi Sotsiologii," Voprosy Filosofii, No. 3 (1961), pp. 86-96.

¹¹ Osipov, Voprosy Filosofii, No. 8, p. 10.

refuses to examine the development of society as a whole and selects instead certain groups as the main object of sociological study. Bourgeois sociology divides all social groups into two major types: "primary groups," or communities, and "secondary groups," or societies. The researchers who study these groups supposedly use empirical theories that of course are essentially a conglomeration of social ideals expressing the class consciousness of the bourgeoisie.

The 'inherent' contradiction between the methodology of Marxist and bourgeois sociological studies is yet another bone of contention. "The contradiction between the methodology of Marxist and bourgeois sociological studies of specific phenomena is expressed in the first place in the fact that identical methods are employed in different ways, and, second, that the relationship between and the significance of the techniques are different." In studying individual problems bourgeois empirical sociology refuses in principle to show general social patterns: empirical sociology raises the particular (i.e., the facts) upon a pedestal and ignores the general (i.e., the laws of the historical process).¹² Therefore Soviet sociologists contend that the bourgeois empirical sociologists typically have a narrow understanding of the objectives of research. A narrow segment of social life is examined on the basis of limited factual data, and even in the best cases only the relationships existing at the surface of social life are discovered.

Not only do the underlying principles of sociological

¹² M.N. Rutkevich and L.N. Kogan, "Methods of Sociological Study of Specific Phenomena," Voprosy Filsofii, No. 3 (1961), translated in The Soviet Review, III, No. 11 (1961), pp. 7-8.

investigation differ, but the actual techniques of Marxist and bourgeois empiricism also vary. On this point some Marxist sociologists are willing to admit that there are some similarities in addition to the large number of differences between Marxist and non-Marxist research techniques. The Soviets say that they are willing to learn the technique of concrete research from bourgeois scientists, but that they must, regardless of the values of the factual material present in the bourgeois studies, constantly "unmask the vicious nature" of the theoretical principles of bourgeois sociology and reveal its harmful influence on concrete research.¹³ What may be shared or adapted would include some rules of observation and interviewing worked out by various bourgeois sociologists and the method of the participating observer, ways to conduct surveys and use various social scales, mathematical methods in the analysis of particular social patterns, and the like.¹⁴

Be that as it may, the Soviets continue to ridicule bourgeois empirical practices. For example, they state that empirical sociologists derive "average" indices for society as a whole or for arbitrarily selected groups instead of studying the life conditions of objectively existing social groups and discovering class characteristics which they hold in common; such average figures and facts, chosen at random, conceal the social differentiation of the population. In the sphere of public opinion research the bourgeois sociologist questions the respondent

¹³ M.D. Kammari, "The Revisionist Myth Concerning the 'Liberation' of Science from Ideology," Voprosy Filosofii, No. 7 (1958), translated by Joint Publications Research Service (May 15, 1959), p. 22.

¹⁴ Osipov, Voprosy Filosofii, No. 8, p. 11.

on a specific subject, but his reply is merely a reflection of his social class position. The Soviets state that the methods of questionnaires and interviews predominate because the bourgeois sociologists can determine the people's subjective opinions by posing provocative questions designed to suggest a desired response.¹⁵ Finally, the bourgeois sociologist makes wide use of models in research; this merely leads to formal, superficial results which do not reveal the essence of the social processes.

Such criticism is included in almost every Soviet magazine article on sociology. Lewis Feuer has noted that "This [the Soviet] conception of philosophy [sociology] as ideological warfare enforces on its practitioners a spirit which we might call 'protivism'", a word meaning 'against'.¹⁶ This spirit of just 'being against' pervades Soviet analysis of whatever comes from the bourgeois world. Feuer suggests that Soviet philosophers, and hence sociologists, fulfill an ideological commitment to the institute head, the section chief, or the magazine editor by this type of 'warfare.'

Having described the internal theoretical dispute about the connection between Soviet sociology (and historical materialism, history, and philosophy) and bourgeois sociology, we can now uncover the theoretical foundation for Soviet social scientists by examining Soviet definitions of sociology and society. Specifically, we must first trace the role and manifest function of the Soviet scientist and social scientist and then delve into the meaning and theories concerning sociology in the

¹⁵ Rutkevich and Kogan, Voprosy Filosofii, No. 3, pp. 10-11.

¹⁶ Lewis S. Feuer, "Meeting the Philosophers," Survey, No. 51 (1964), pp. 16-17.

Soviet system.

The Soviets claim that science in the twentieth century can no longer be an individual endeavor. Since the scientist lives within society and is a member of that society, it is the society which directs and plans his creative efforts. The impetus that society gives to the scientist is the result of an unbreakable link between society and science.¹⁷ According to the Soviets modern science depends on the character of the social structure of the given society. In fact, they say that there is only one objective truth in science and that it is revealed in a complex and contradictory cognition process which is socially conditioned and which takes place under the strong influence of ideological class struggles.¹⁸ Every science is at the service of definite social forces or classes and is developed by people belonging to these various classes. Therefore there is a specific class imprint on the actual content of the sciences which necessarily affects their application.

In the Soviet Union both the government and the society plan scientific research; the principal directions of the work of the sciences are included in the national economic plan, the assumption being that the successful development of modern science and technology requires centralized and coordinated direction. Such activity serves as a stimulus to the scientist's initiative if his thoughts are aimed at the solution of scientific problems of "real importance," such as building communism.

¹⁷ Nikolai Semyonov, "Science and Society in the Atomic Age," Voprosy Filosofii, No. 7 (1960), translated in The Soviet Review, II, No. 3 (1961), p. 46.

¹⁸ Kammari, Voprosy Filosofii, No. 7, p. 14.

Then the government actively assists the scientist.¹⁹ In return the scientist is expected to participate according to his abilities in the national objective of building a communist society.

If science is under the control of society, the social system, and the government, then social science as a branch of science must also be under such control. Within this framework the social scientist studies social phenomena and the "trends of their changes, thereby obtaining a complete scientific description of the phenomena."²⁰ But the social scientist, instructed by the USSR Academy of Sciences and the Communist Party, must mainly focus his attention on the problems of the formation of communist culture. In the same vein, Vice President of the USSR Academy of Sciences, P.N. Fedosayev, lists the three conditions that the social sciences must meet in order to fulfill the demands of the party and the people: 1) they must concentrate on the theoretical solution to the problems of building communism and of contemporary world-development; 2) they must cement the relationship between various social sciences and the natural sciences in multi-field research; and 3) they must evolve a common scientific methodology.²¹

Furthermore in 1962 the General Meeting of the USSR Academy of Sciences resolved to provide for intensified empirical studies of social phenomena in Soviet society. For this purpose they have resolved to expand expeditionary work, to employ statistical materials more extensively, and

¹⁹ Semyonov, Voprosy Filosofii, No. 7, p. 26.

²⁰ M.P. Gapochka, O.M. Karpenko, and E.I. Kuftin, "Stroitelstvo Kommunizma i Zadachi Obshchestvennikh Nauk," Voprosy Filosofii, No. 1 (1963), p. 131.

²¹ Ibid., pp. 133-34.

to use dialectical materialism and other advanced scientific methods more efficaciously.²² Added to these resolutions is the call to the social science journals to influence the development of the social sciences and to present new social science issues and problems to the scholars.

Interspersed with praise for the social sciences we find criticisms that social science research lags behind natural science research and that exact methods of scientific research are still infrequently used. But in the end the laurels for Marxist-Leninist social science achievements are placed on the party, which, it is said, fuses theory and practice together.²³ Not only has the party highly elevated the role of the social sciences, but its Third Program serves as a model for fundamental social changes over a significant historical period and an inspiring example for Marxist research in all social sciences, including sociology.²⁴

Soviet sociology, the science of society, or more specifically the Marxist theory of society, is seen in the Soviet Union as proceeding from Marx's basic laws, embracing the entire socio-historic process, and, in exploring the entire life of society as a whole, concerning itself with all social phenomena. Lenin used the term 'sociology' as

²² "Problems of Social Sciences Development under Conditions of the Extensive Building of Communism," Vestnik Akademii Nauk SSSR, Vol. XXXII, No. 12 (1962), translated by Joint Publications Research Service (Feb. 28, 1963), pp. 8-9.

²³ Ibid., pp. 4-5.

²⁴ G.V. Osipov et al., "Marxist Sociology and its Sociological Research," Nauchnye Koklady Vysshei Shkoly: Filosofskie Nauki, No. 5 (1962), translated by Joint Publications Research Service (March 25, 1963), p. 12.

meaning social science in its most general form, just as we use the term 'natural science' to describe the totality of the natural sciences. Thus, while the object of investigation in all the social sciences is the same, namely society, each special science investigates different aspects of society and different forms of social relationships.²⁵ Sociology specifically answers such questions as: What is society? On what does its growth or decay depend? What is the relation between the various groups of social phenomena? What are the historical forms of society?

Marxist sociology, based upon the aggregate findings of the other social sciences, studies universal laws of social development as well as the concrete forms in which these laws manifest themselves. Within the framework of Marxian theory, the dialectical materialist, or the Marxist, examines both the universal laws and the connections between people as relations determined by material circumstances. Proceeding from the general postulates of theory, the most important task of Marxist sociology is conceived to be that of further developing theory. In his special concrete investigations the Marxist sociologist discovers new phenomena which, investigated in other fields as well as in sociology, are finally generalized into theory.²⁶

We cannot understand either the theoretical function or the practical tasks of Soviet sociology without having a clear view of the Soviet outlook on society, society and

²⁵ Just as each social science has its particular subject of research, so each science has its particular method or technique for the investigation of the given kind of social relationship; this is discussed in Chapter III below.

²⁶ Rutkevich and Kogan, Voprosy Filosofii, No. 3.

the individual, social development, and social change.²⁷ Society is defined as the broadest system of mutually interacting persons within the context of labor. This materialist view of society states that material production and its means (the material productive forces) constitute the foundations of the existence of human society. The society, which forms the environment, shapes the individual. Proceeding in accordance with the uniform laws of Marxian development, man evolves into a rational and social being both in the course of history and in his economic and social activity.

Is change possible in this society? Yes! Since there is nothing that is without cause, it is clear that there can be no such thing as accident. The concept of 'accident' must be abolished from the social system since society and its evolution are as much subject to natural law as is everything else in the universe.²⁸ Therefore, if we know the laws of social growth (and according to Soviet dogma, we do, thanks to Marx), the paths along which society necessarily travels, and the direction of this evolution, we can define the direction of future society and future change which, as of 1963, is defined as the transition to communism.

²⁷ This discussion is based on Nikolai Bukharin's Historical Materialism: A Study of Sociology written in 1925.

²⁸ Nikolai Bukharin, Historical Materialism: A Study of Sociology (4th Ed.), New York: International Publishers, 1933, pp. 44-46.

THE SOCIOLOGIST AND HIS WORK

The Soviet sociologist is usually a philosopher who conducts research with the cooperation of scientists from the natural and social sciences, especially those from history, economics, ethnography, and law. These scientists are then joined by a practical staff from government, party, Soviet, economic, trade-union, cooperative (kolkhoz and sovkhoz), and other organizations as well as by the staffs of central and local statistical bureaus.

The Soviets proudly point out that Soviet sociological research differs from research carried out in capitalist countries because the party organization offers special help, as do the entire personnel of industrial enterprises. Nonetheless, with all the help offered to sociological research by the various sciences and organizations, sociology per se has no base within Soviet academic institutions. Unlike anthropology, for example, sociology does not have its own Institute in the USSR Academy of Sciences but comes under the Philosophy Institute. This partially explains why authors of 'sociological' articles are not referred to as sociologists. In fact, people are referred to as sociologists only in a collective sense; never does a specific individual have the title 'sociologist' before or after his name. (Instead, he is a member of the USSR Academy of Sciences.) I found no mention of students of sociology until August 1963, when Olshansky, writing in Partinaya Zhizn, noted that the USSR Academy of Sciences' Philosophy Institute in Moscow had six graduate students studying applied sociological methods, when no admission of graduate students were planned in this field in 1963.

He further noted, with disgust I might add, that the situation was not better in other educational institutions.¹

With no academic backing, can there be any doubt that the status of the Soviet sociologist is shaky? Leopold Labedz writes his opinions of the Soviet sociologists at Stresa in 1959:

They are not entirely happy with their status and they try to raise it by association. At home, despite the privileges granted to them, their status is low in comparison with the real Soviet scientists, i.e. those working in the natural sciences, who naturally do not have any high regard for them. They are therefore rather eager to attend international conferences, which, they feel, confer on them some of the lustre of 'bourgeois science,' officially scorned and secretly envied. Such contacts with their 'ideological opponents' provide them with an opportunity to improve their domestic position. On the other hand, having nothing to offer in real intellectual achievement when abroad, they try to get some credit by association with the achievements of Soviet technologists.²

This is how the Soviet sociologists acted and reacted at the 1959 World Congress of Sociology.

Since sociology does not appear to be taught as a distinct discipline, one way to discover and then examine who the sociologists are is to investigate the delegates to the most recent World Congress of Sociology held in Washington, D.C., in 1962.

¹V. Olshansky, "Rely on Applied Sociological Research," Partiinaya Zhizn, No. 15 (1963), translated in The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, XV. No. 33 (September 11, 1963), p. 9.

²Leopold Labedz, "Sociologists in Conference: The Spirit of Stresa," Soviet Survey, No. 31 (January - March, 1960), pp. 23-24.

No individual can simply decide to go to the Congress on his own; he must, as Feuer points out, be selected by the Academy of Sciences, and only then, knowing that he is trusted to make 'decisions' as a member of the hierarchically organized delegation, may he attend.³ In fact, all of the Soviet delegates to this Congress except one were from the Moscow area, yet the best Soviet research does not originate in Moscow. Nevertheless an examination of what these delegates had written in magazines and books during the year 1962 is informative and indicates their background or areas of concentration.

Four out of the eighteen delegates did no writing whatsoever in 1962, but they did write prior to that year. Six wrote two or more articles in a magazine. More than half of these articles were published in philosophy journals, about one fourth were published in political magazines, and the remaining few were published in economic or cultural magazines. Half of the delegates had written at least one book. An examination of the titles and contents shows that almost every one of their books falls into the range of philosophy as studied in the Soviet Union. One or two of them could be classified as economics, the others are philosophy. Furthermore the chosen delegates were primarily concerned with general theory almost to the complete exclusion of empirical sociological research. (See Appendix I.)

The author's rank in the academic hierarchy seems to determine the kind of product the three types of men produced. The Candidates of Science unanimously wrote on

³Lewis S. Feuer has thrown light on the selection process in his article, "Meeting the Philosophers," in the April, 1964, issue of Survey, see especially pp. 16-17.

some use of bourgeois life--its sociology, its ideology, its class struggle, its literature, and its limits: they were students (albeit critics) of Western sociology. The Doctors of Science primarily concentrated on subjects which could be classified under Marxist philosophy--dialectical materialism, historical materialism, theory of communist education and labor, philosophy after the 20th Party Congress, scientific communism, and of course building communism. It is more difficult to generalize about the 3 member-correspondents of the USSR Academy of Sciences. One has written on his speciality, medicine; another focused on communist development and Lenin; the third discussed the anti-Marxist activity of Albanian leadership and fundamental Marxist philosophy. The latter two thus appear to have concentrated on official policy doctrine. Furthermore the academic rank of the delegate and his type of writing correspond with age, thus suggesting a generation difference.

Data on the place (the city and the institutio where sociological research is conducted and the topics of such research, presented on the following chart, give us an over-all view of Soviet sociological research.

<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>INSTITUTION</u>	<u>TOPICS</u>
Moscow	Institute of Philosophy of the Soviet Academy of Sciences' section for sociological research	New forms of labor and daily life
Moscow	Academy of Social Sciences, Central Committee of the CPSU [Training center for Party educational institutions.]	No publications in sociology yet.
Moscow	Laboratory of Sociological Studies attached to the Philosophy faculty of Moscow University	Abolition of the differences between mental and manual labor
Moscow	Laboratory of Sociological Research at Moscow State University	Sociological significance of production automation
Leningrad	Laboratory of Sociological Studies at Leningrad University	Workers' attitudes and effect on them of technological change. Processes of converting labor into the primary vital necessity
Leningrad	Philosophical section of the USSR Academy of Sciences	Family relations Time budgets
Leningrad	To be established in Leningrad - an Institute of Human Studies - to coordinate the work of sociology, economics, psychology and education.	

<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>INSTITUTION</u>	<u>TOPIC</u>
Urals (Sverdlovsk)	Laboratory for Sociological Research of the Urals State University and Philosophy de- partment (Dept. of Dialectical and Historical Materialism)	Rise of cultural- technical level of workers Changes in the social structure of Soviet society Changes in educational level of working class Development of person- ality of Soviet worker
Kiev	Laboratory for Sociological research at Kiev State University	All-around development of the personality Time budgets Time budgets and free time
Siberia (Novosibirsk)	Siberian sector of the USSR Academy of Sciences	See Section IV
Moscow	Public Opinion Institute	
Sociological laboratories either exist or are being established in Voronezh. Novosibirsk, and Rostov.		

⁴The material for this chart was collected from the following: V.D. Kudryatsev, "Book Review: Topics of Scientific Research Works in Siberia and the Far East, 1959-63. Social Sciences," Izvestiya Sibirskogo Otdeleniya Akademii Nauk SSSR, No. 6 (1960), translated by Joint Publications Research Service (September 7, 1961), pp. 1-2; Labeledz, Survey, No. 48, p. 62; "On the Work of a Sociology Seminar," Vestnik Leningradskogo Universiteta, Seriia Ekonomiki, Filosofii i Prava, No. 1 (1960), 62; Osipov

These topics are self-explanatory. For each subject, almost all the articles have a similar style. The form of reasoning behind the arguments--be it for the growth of the working class, the abolition of the difference between mental and manual labor, or the changes in the educational level of the working class--is identical: a statement is made, a quote from Marx or Lenin follows, and the conclusions say, "Hence it is so." The data for each topic and the conclusions drawn from the data hardly vary. The following discussion represents generalizations gleaned from a few articles which I feel are representative of each specific field.

The first is the family. The basic principle behind research on the family is that the family is affected by the building of the material-technical base of communism. The studies show that as the family becomes stronger, the wife has more free time and can enter the working force, the woman's unequal position in domestic life is abolished, and the possibility for the further development of the family unit and the greater mental "approximation" between husband and wife increases. Thus the family is being strengthened, the research proves, on the basis of the rising standard of living.⁵

The Soviet ethnographer is doing research on the family primarily to obtain results in the field of culture and customs. The ethnographer is concerned with the structure of the family (its forms, numbers, characteristics of relatives' connection), internal structure, cultural level, private budget, educational level, role of

et al., Nauchnie Doklady Vysshei Shkoly: Filosofskie Nauki, No. 5, pp. 13-14; Osipov and Yovchuk, American Sociological Review, XXVIII, No. 4, p. 623; Rutkevich and Kogan, Voprosy Filosofii, No. 3, pp. 15-16; George Fischer, Science and Politics: The New Sociology in the Soviet Union.

⁵Ye. G. Balagushkin, "Stroitelstvo Kommunizma i Razvitie Brachno - Semeinykh Otnoshenii," Voprosy Filosofii, No. 3 (1962), pp. 31-38.

the woman in production, role of the komsomol, and so on. From the family questionnaires the ethnographer makes a genealogy of the worker's family: place of birth, nationality, mother tongue, social position, occupation of head of family, grandfathers and forefathers on both sides. These researchers hope to learn not only the interaction between socio-economic, cultural, and customary habits but also the character and direction of over-all change which results in the culture and habits of all the people.⁶

Urban development is another topic for research. The three bases on which all work for urban development stems are the growth of the industrial population and of industrial centres, the proportional, relatively even distribution of industry and the population over the whole country, and the abolition of the "antithesis" and of essential differences between town and country. Town-builders and sociologists in this field are charged by the program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union with further developing both central cities and complex districts of all inhabited centers. These districts will be organic complexes of production zones, dwelling areas, and a network of service-and-cultural institutions.⁷

The Soviet researchers are also doing studies on the present problem of juvenile delinquency. One typical study includes questions on the following subjects:

⁶ V. Yu. Krupyanskaya, "K Vorposu O Problematike i Metodike Etnograficheskovo Izucheniya Sovetskovo Rabochevo Klassa," Voprosy Istorii, No. 11 (1960), pp. 40-49.

⁷ Yu. P. Bocharov and V.I. Rabinovich, "Stroitelstvo Kommunizma: Problema Razvitiya Nashikh Gorodov," Voprosy Filosofii, No. 2 (1962), pp. 25-36.

What were the living conditions and upbringing during childhood and youth?

parents alive?

brought up by step-parents?

Was there weakness in the work of the schools?

Was there unsatisfactory job finding?

Was there inadequate character training?

Was there an influence of liquor?

Why was there crime?

a) money for personal needs?

b) money for vodka and amusements?

c) out of foolishness?

It also suggests a way to conduct a systematic overall study of juvenile delinquency and its causes, covering every district and region in the country: the study should be conducted jointly by scientists, officials of the justice agencies, government institutions dealing with child education, commissions in charge of the affairs of minors, and so on.⁸

Compared with other Soviet sociological material, the articles on stratification most clearly resemble a party primer on the future society. The Soviets are concerned with identifying and aiding trends toward a wholly different class structure. Thus the subject of class structure and stratification is linked to official doctrine as well as to 'scholarly' theory; the nature and development of the class structure plays a key role in official pronouncements.

Of eighteen articles examined on stratification,⁹ the first article leads off with a discussion of social change and laws. It is followed by two articles, one relating

⁸Yevgeni Boldryev, "The Study and Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency," Sovetskoe Gosudarstvo i Pravo, No. 12 (1960), translated in The Soviet Review, II, No. 5 (1961), pp. 20-27.

⁹These articles are listed separately in the bibliography in the order they are here discussed. Also see Fischer's analysis of stratification and classes in his Chapter 7.

classes to society, the other relating classes to the party. The fourth and fifth articles introduce the reader to 'social mobility' and the class structure in capitalist society. The sixth article is of more than routine interest as the debaters--from two socialist countries, Poland and the Soviet Union--discuss Marx's theories and introduce or censure a new theory of social stratification. The next few articles discuss the change in the individual's position from that of a member of a class to the point when a truly free, distinctive person will be the product of a classless, communist society.

The remaining half of the articles focus on the class structure per se. The social structure consists of three classes--the peasants, the workers, and the intelligentsia. These classes, it is said, will merge together into one class, the working class, which indicates that the Soviet Union will be a classless society in the Marxist sense. Proof of the elimination of the class boundaries lies mainly in showing that the two classes--the intelligentsia and the peasant class--are losing in numbers as the working class grows and absorbs the members of these former two classes.

There are several factors which are aiding in the elimination of the class boundaries. One is automation. With the dynamic growth of automation, the difference between mental and physical labor, so long a factor of dividing people into classes, is to be eliminated. Second, with the abolition of differences between the city and the countryside, the Soviet theoreticians explain that, again, the class boundaries will be overcome. A third reason dates back to the initial 1917 Revolution, in which the exploiting and exploited classes were destroyed. Therefore all trends seem to lead, according to the current journals, to the fact that the difference between the

three classes will be abolished and the communist form of society free from classes, will be established.

The subjects for sociological research are discussed not only in the scientific journals but also at conferences. Unless these conferences are not written up when they occur, it seems that they are few and far between. One such conference took place at the end of 1960 in Stalinsk, where the problem of workers' free time, caused by the reduction of the working day, was the main topic.¹⁰ In January 1961 another conference was held in Sverdlovsk, where the research done in the following fields was reviewed: technical progress and the raising of the cultural-technical level of the working class, cultural-technical advance and the pleasing of the social side of the socialist society, and the role of free time in raising the cultural-technical level of the working class.¹¹ Later that year a meeting was held to discuss the pros and cons of the research conducted by Komsomolskaya Pravda's Public Opinion Institute. (See below.)

In February 1961 the Soviet Sociological Association, established in 1958, held its second general meeting. Papers were delivered by G.V. Osipov on the use of sociological experiments in research, by E.A. Grushin on the Komsomolskaya Pravda's public opinion studies, by A.A. Zvorikin on automation and its effects on workers, by V.S. Semenov on the change in the social structure, by

¹⁰ V. Bolgov and I. Chernov, "Svobodnoe Vremya Trudyashchikhsya V Usloviyakh Sskrashcheniya Rabochevo Dnya," Voprosy Ekonomiki, No. 2 (1961), p. 158.

¹¹ L.P. Chrina, "Povishenie Kulturno-Tekhnicheskovo Urovnya Trudyashchikhsya," Voprosy Filosofii, No. 8 (1961), p. 153.

P.P. Maslov and G.A. Prudensky on the use of leisure time.¹² Other participants in the discussion were V.K. Gardanov (Institute of Ethnography, USSR Academy of Sciences), G.P. Lebedev (Academy of Social Sciences, Central Committee of the CPSU), and V.S. Nemchenko (Institute of Labor), who familiarized the meeting with the major sociological research being conducted in the agencies they represent.¹³ This conference also made mention of the work being done by the Leningrad seminar on sociology, set up in 1958 or 1959 within the framework of the Soviet Sociological Association but "organized on the initiative of a group of university personnel to conduct studies on problems on which the scholars of Leningrad are working."¹⁴ Its fifty participants are studying the rise in the culture and skill of the workers at Leningrad enterprises, the cause of crime and the measures for combatting it, the social significance and role of education in the Soviet Union, and the problems of marriage and the family under socialism.¹⁵

Besides setting up this Leningrad seminar as its Leningrad branch, the Soviet Sociological Association is

¹² V.V. Kolbanovskii and G.A. Slesarev. "Obshchee Sobranie Sovetskoi Sotsiologicheskoi Assotsiatsii," Voprosy Filosofii, No. 5 (1961), pp. 152-153.

¹³ V.K. Gardanov, "Current Problems in Soviet Sociological Research," Sovetskaya Etnografiia, No. 4 (1961), translated in Soviet Sociology, I, No. 3 (Winter, 1962-63), p. 64.

¹⁴ "On the Work of a Sociology Seminar," Vestnik Leningradskogo Universiteta: Seriya Ekonomiki, Filosofii i Prava, No. 1 (1960), translated in The Soviet Review, I, No. 1 (Aug., 1960), p. 62.

¹⁵ Gardanov, Sovetskaya Etnografiia, No. 4, p. 62.

active in distributing information gathered by the various scientific establishments and universities. And in 1962, a year devoid of conferences, I suppose the Soviet Sociological Association prepared for the Fifth World Congress of Sociology, where the topics of sociology, political workers and society; sociological development; and essence and problems of sociological theory were discussed. As far as I know, 1963 had no (publicized) conferences.¹⁶

As we have seen, the majority of the Soviet sociologists are philosophers who become social scientists because they concentrate on social laws and theory. A majority of these men focus their attention primarily on ideological aspects, merely reiterating Marxist social theory on given topics. This holds true for those scientists who attended the Fifth World Congress of Sociology and also applies to most of those scientists who write in the Soviet journals. A minority, who also are not trained as sociologists are philosophers who leave the ranks of philosophy and enter those of sociology by performing actual empirical or 'sociological' research of a kind of interest to sociologists elsewhere in the world.

¹⁶V.S. Semenov, "Na V Vsemirnom Setsiologicheskom Kongresse," Voprosy Filosofii, No. 11 (1962), p. 19.

RESEARCH THEORY

Discussing the role of sociology in the Soviet Union in front of the Fifth World Sociological Congress in 1962, Osipov and Yovchuk reported that the purpose for conducting concrete sociological investigations, which should yield more than merely illustrative material from local life, was that they provide significant data for understanding the processes occurring in Soviet society during the period of building communism. This accumulation of new experience, which then requires generalization, intelligent comprehension, and propagation, should provide the Soviet researchers with opportunities to study the regularities in the development of society.¹

Marxist concrete sociological studies must of course be said to be based on the theory and methodology of historical materialism. Within this framework the researcher's over-all task is to discover the laws--the regularity and the order--which the mass of individual phenomena follow. The laws sought after presuppose the presence, first, of something common, and second, of something to some degree persistent in the phenomena under study.² Thus in this basic structure the completeness of the social analysis depends on the ability of the

¹Osipov and Yovchuk, American Sociological Review, XXVIII, No. 4, p. 621.

²P.P. Maslov, "Modeling in Sociological Research," Voprosy Filosofii, No. 3 (1962), translated in Joint Publications Research Service (May 7, 1962).

researcher to be guided by the knowledge of the natural laws of development both in determining the goals of investigation and the most rational methods of carrying it out. Research should show how the general theoretical patterns are manifested in their concrete forms and should prove the reality of the theory. Research must also generalize positive experience and introduce useful adaptations for communist construction, thereby accelerating the rates of social development.³

Conceivably, special importance accrues to concrete sociological research which studies the interaction between socio-economic and ideological phenomena. The study of the historical and revolutionary experience of the masses, the generalization of the experience of building socialism and communism, the work of the state, party, and social organizations, the institutions and enterprises--these are the stated central tasks of concrete sociological research which will influence the communist plan of growth.⁴ In Soviet terms these tasks are: change in the social structure of the country; change in the manifestation and character of labor; study of the cultural-technical rise of the working class; development of the communist social self-control; study of the Soviet family and its function; and change in the many-sided spiritual life of the Soviet man.⁵ The party further charges sociological research with the exposure of

³Osipov et al., Nauchnie Doklady Vysshei Shkoly: Filosofskie Nauki, No. 5, p. 5.

⁴Rozhin, op.cit., p. 18.

⁵Osipov et al., Nauchnie Doklady Vysshei Shkoly: Filosofskie Nauki, No. 5, pp. 15-16.

bourgeois ideology, reformist theory and practice, revisionism and dogmatism.⁶

According to Soviet writings on the growth of sociology, interest in concrete sociological research increased after the victory of the Great October Revolution. In the twenties and thirties there were published more than three hundred books and pamphlets that showed the results of concrete research and outlined techniques for their investigation. However, "under the conditions of the Stalin cult, from the mid-thirties to 1953, an unfavorable situation existed for concrete sociological research." During that time the CPSU and Soviet scholars under its guidance worked primarily on theoretical and ideological problems, on "important questions" of Marxist sociology, historical materialism, and building of a socialist society. After the Twenty-second Party Congress a new concern for research again began. "In recent years a number of sociological investigations have been conducted in our country that have permitted important theoretical and practical conclusions."⁷

The methods of modern research now in use, according to Leningrad researcher Beliaev, include: "analysis of documents and statistical data, oral and written interviews with the population, the study of diary entries, the compilation of individual cards for members of groups

⁶ M.A. Suslov, "XXII Sezd KPSS i Zadachi Kafedr Obshchestvennikh Nauk," Kommunist, No. 3 (1962), p. 31.

⁷ M.T. Iovchuk and G.V. Osipov, "On Some Theoretical Principles, Problems and Methods of Sociological Research," Voprosy Filosofii, No. 12 (1963) translated in Current Digest of the Soviet Press, XV, No. 6 (1963), p. 15.

under study, the holding of scientific and theoretical conferences and some others.⁸

Of these techniques, the interview and the questionnaire have aroused considerable comment from Soviet researchers. They advise the interviewer to adhere closely to the formal questionnaire so that all persons queried are posed identical questions for the purposes of obtaining comparable data. In the same breath the Soviet researchers point out that the advantage of the interview over the written questionnaire is that the interviewer is in a position to obtain a more precise reply by posing additional questions and urging frank conversation. These two contrasting views on the usefulness of the interview are held by Soviet and Western researchers alike. How strange then is the Soviet warning by Rutkevich and Kogan, that one of the shortcomings of the interview method is the impossibility of determining how typical is the person questioned. For some research, they add, the interview should be supplemented by diary notes kept by the subject.⁹

Researchers who use the questionnaire as the sole method of research have lately been under criticism. The critics admit that the questionnaire makes possible a rapid accumulation of factual data from a large number of respondents, as well as a simple processing of such data, but they usually add that it should be supplemented by other forms of research. Whether questionnaires are used alone or in conjunction with other methods, researchers are

⁸E.V. Beliaev et al., "Workers' Time-Budget Research: A Method of Concrete Sociological Investigation," Vestnik Leningradskogo Universiteta, Seriya Ekonomiki, Filosofii i Prava, No. 4 (1961), translated in Soviet Sociology, I, No. 1 (Summer, 1962), p. 44.

⁹Rutkevich and Kogan, Voprosy Filosofii, No. 3, p. 13.

urged to prepare them carefully so as to include only those questions that are formulated properly to achieve the purposes of the research and do not duplicate material already available in official statistical reports.¹⁰ Social scientist Olshansky has recently suggested that a study be made of the methodology of drawing up questionnaires, making the proper choice of control group, and processing the results obtained scientifically since no such methodology exists.¹¹

Soviet researchers also stress the use of mathematical and statistical methods for concrete sociological research, for they feel that these methods provide an accurate and objective description of the quantitative aspects of social processes and events. "Modelling in sociological research" has become one way of employing these methods.¹² P. P. Maslov, laying the foundation for model research, says that the construction of a model presupposes a certain definite group and certain definite system of ideas (e.g., the generic development of society). The question of the rightfulness and sufficiency of the assumptions made in the construction of the model is to be decided by its empirical testing, usually statistically. Therefore a constructed model may be considered successful when its use reveals a capacity to explain facts collected experimentally. Maslov says that the model acquires a still greater cognitive value when it permits prediction of the existence of

¹⁰ Osipov et al., Nauchnie Doklady Vysshei Shkoly: Filosofskie Nauki, No. 5, pp. 9-10.

¹¹ Olshansky, Partiinaya Zhizn, No. 15, p. 9.

¹² The discussion on models comes from P.P. Maslov's article "Modeling in Sociological Research," previously cited.

hitherto unanalyzed facts and supplies the impetus for purposeful probes. With the help of a model the researcher may make deductions and may draw conclusions which could not be obtained on the basis of individual distribution of empirical data only. Thus a model makes it possible to enrich the investigation of phenomena, to expand it "beyond the bounds of immediate observations."¹³ But the construction of a functional model in the field of social life is justified, Maslov points out, only on condition that it be strictly based on and substantiated by historical material and that "its parameters be subject to a material interpretation."¹⁴

Published material on the use or practice of the model in sociological research, besides Maslov's article, is not available. In contrast, data on Soviet research in the areas of public opinion polls and time budgets are accessible and are examined in detail in the next two sections.

¹³ Maslov, Voprosy Filosofii, No. 3, p. 13.

¹⁴ ibid.

IV

PUBLIC OPINION POLLS

The Soviets claim that public opinion in the Soviet Union and research on it rest on different principles from those in the West. In the first place, the Soviets consider the influence of public opinion more important in socialist countries than in capitalist countries because of the increased role of the masses in the state and in the productive and cultural life of the society.¹ In fact, they argue that the distinguishing feature of a socialist society is the forming of a united public opinion whereas in bourgeois society the opinion of the exploiter classes resists the opinion of the working classes and the laboring masses.

In theory the basic method for the Soviet study of public opinion is the method of nation-wide discussion of vitally important problems that gives the people an opportunity to express their opinion.² Their opinion is formed, however, with the aid of the Communist Party together with the trade unions and komsomol organizations, which train the masses in the communist 'spirit' and thereby influence the formation of public opinion.

The Marxist, however, does not deny the necessity for and the significance of public opinion studies per se.

¹A.K. Udelov, "Public Opinion as a Subject of Sociological Research," Voprosy Filosofii, No. 3 (1959), translated in Joint Publications Research Service (August 9, 1962), p. 6.

²Ibid., p. 13.

The results of such studies are supposedly considered by the government and their influence felt in all spheres of public life. But, for the Marxist, "people's opinions constitute a more or less accurate, although sometimes distorted, reflection of the real conditions of life."³

The Soviets believe that the conducting of a questionnaire poll in itself constitutes a means of activating public opinion by focusing its attention on important social problems. The educational importance of polling is further advanced by publishing the most characteristic answers to the questionnaire in the periodical press, thus evoking broad discussion. In working out the subject of the inquiries the "most urgent" questions are selected from the point of view of the immediate interests of the masses of the working class.⁴

As for the actual method of polling, the Soviet researchers set many stipulations. Since the answers, they say, must reflect the actual objective opinions of the people, those being polled must be selected in such a way that the average may be judged from them.⁵ Strange as it may seem, the Soviets are opposed to 'selective' or random polling. They identify selective polling, which may be an auxiliary method for the study of public opinion, with the unscientific research of bourgeois sociology.

³Rutkevich and Kogan, Voprosy Filosofii, No. 3, p. 11.

⁴M. KH. Igithkayan, "The Spiritual Image of Soviet Youth," Voprosy Filosofii, No. 6 (1963), translated in The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, XV, No. 39 (October 23, 1963), p. 18.

⁵Yu. K., "In the Statistical Section of the Moscow House of Scholars," Vestnik Statistiki, No. 6 (1961), translated by Joint Publications Research Service, p. 2.

They argue that this type of polling cannot be recognized as a scientific method of studying public opinion because, since the persons polled are selected from the population in a completely arbitrary way, the material obtained is extremely limited, making it impossible to draw conclusions concerning public opinion. For the Soviet researcher, sufficient attention to selecting the persons and groups of the population to participate in the poll is one of the conditions for objective analysis.⁶

May 19, 1960 marked a turning point in the study of public opinion in the Soviet Union. On that day Komsomolskaya Pravda, the Young Communist League's daily newspaper, opened its Public Opinion Institute with this statement of its intentions:

Today Komsomolskaya Pravda opens its PUBLIC OPINION INSTITUTE. With its help, the newspaper intends to study and report the opinions of Soviet people on timely questions of the domestic and foreign policies of the USSR, on questions of the education of the working people. Such a study will make it possible to take into account the most diverse opinions; this is important in the practice of propaganda work. It will be conducted through sociological investigations and the questioning of broad strata of the population simultaneously in various geographical regions of the country. In studying public opinion, the institute will rely on the active participation and help of public organizations, particularly the Young Communist aktiv.⁷

Such was the birth of the Public Opinion Institute. It employs only five people, but staff members and graduate

⁶Udelov, Voprosy Filosofii, No. 3, p. 12.

⁷"Komsomolskaya Pravda's Public Opinion Institute," Komsomolskaya Pravda (May 19, 1960), translated in The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, XII, No. 20 (1960), p. 24.

students of the USSR Central Statistical Administration's central computer station and students of many of Moscow's higher educational institutions work with members of the Komsomolskaya Pravda staff in analyzing and generalizing the results.

Between May 1960 and January 1963 five polls were conducted by the Institute. The subjects and questions for these polls are presented in App. II. Of the five, results were tabulated for the first three. How were these polls conducted?

The poll on averting war was the first carried out by the Public Opinion Institute and consequently may be expected to be the most crude.⁸ Ten localities along the 30th meridian (which, since it runs through four Union Republics, should be representative of regional opinions) were chosen on the basis of the social and occupational diversity of those to be questioned. (But what of those areas not represented? Do people in the different regions of the Soviet Union diversely affected or not affected by World War II, hold the same opinions? This is an unanswered question.) Of the people chosen at random, 60 per cent were men, 40 per cent women. About one half of the respondents were workers, 12 per cent collective farmers and 12 per cent office employees, 10 per cent students and 10 per cent servicemen, and 5 per cent pensioners and housewives. Thus the proportions for sex and occupation did not follow those of the population as a whole. Age-wise, the 1,000 respondents were divided into four age groups: 14 to 25, 26 to 32, 33 to 45, and over 45. The proportion of the entire population falling

⁸ Komsomolskaya Pravda (May 19, 1960), pp. 24-29.

into the first two groups corresponds favorably with the proportion of respondents of the sample in the same categories. This is not so for the last two age groups. The sample contained more people from the 33 to 45 age group than those in the over-45 age group, whereas in the actual population, the over-45 group is greater in number than the 33 to 45 category.

"Komsomolskaya Pravda sees in the result of the poll a complete vindication and support of the Soviet government's foreign policy. Judging by the replies that are printed this is not an unfair interpretation since many of them are written in the familiar formulae used by Soviet propaganda."⁹ But not all. The range of differences was interesting. Some respondents replied that war will be averted because "war is not a means of settling international disputes--the history of the last two world wars proves this." A collective farmer in Dno said that "we have nothing to gain by war, we have restored all that the Germans destroyed at the farm." Another optimistic farmer in the same region suggested that "the people do not want war, and since the people do not want it, they will have their way." A student at the S. M. Kirov Pedagogical Institute at Vitebsk pointed to the tragedies of Hiroshima and the German concentration camps as "facts which live in people's minds; therefore people will not permit a war." The majority, affirming that mankind will succeed in averting war, gave as their reasons either the downfall or 'senility' of capitalism, the Soviet Union's rocketry, technological and scientific strength, or the staunch policy of the CP and the government.

⁹ Hugh Lunghi, "Opinion Probe in Russia," European Service General News Talk (May 26, 1960), p. 4.

The reply to the third question--"What must be done above all to strengthen peace?"--showed a variety of opinions. One in ten saw a guarantee of peace in the Soviet Union's possession of powerful military technology, including rocket technology. About half based their positive answers on the impact of the movement of working people of all countries for world peace. More than one half directly related the strengthening of peace to their own work, to further strengthening the economic and defense capacity of the Soviet Union and the socialist camp. There were also numerous expressions of the need to heighten vigilance. Those people who believed that it is unlikely that war will be averted placed the blame primarily on the "criminal foreign policy of some bourgeois states and the frankly aggressive acts against the countries of socialism." The tone of all the replies suggested concern over the use of the atom bomb, disarmament, and the U-2 incident.

Five months later, in October 1960, the second poll was conducted on the subject of how one's standard of living had changed.¹⁰ The questionnaire was distributed by railroad conductors to 1,600 people in a single carriage on each of 65 trains leaving Moscow on one day. (I agree with Soviet critics that the poll poorly represented the kolkhoz workers while it stressed those people traveling "under-orders" or on vacation.) Again the proportion of men to women (3 to 2) and the occupational categories did not coincide with the actual population as a whole. Moreover, we would expect a poll on standards of living to include a question on the

¹⁰"How Has Your Living Standard Changed?", Komsomolskaya Pravda (October 7, 1960), translated in The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, XII, No. 41 (1960), pp. 9-18.

respondent's level of education since education is an important factor in increasing one's status and standard of living,¹¹ but this poll did not. The results from the poll showed that 73 per cent of the population had experienced a rise in their standard of living while 20 per cent experienced no change. This rise was experienced for all strata all over the country. In addition to these favorable replies, the 'decline' answers, accounting for 7 per cent of the sample, were also discussed, along with suggestions for improving the standard of living. The Soviet pollsters concluded, as they did in the first poll, that people link the standard of living with the policy of the Communist Party and its policies in the socialist state, and that the Soviet people wholeheartedly support the Communist Party's Central Committee's policy. They also happily note that except for 59 people everyone made suggestions; this is interpreted to mean that the broadest strata of the public are objectively interested in nationwide social development. (N.B. The day after the results of the poll were published Komsomolskaya Pravda printed comments by various state ministers praising the results and discussing the suggestions.)

The third poll, begun in January 1961 and tabulated by July, was on a subject of great contemporary interest, the Soviet youth.¹² By the end of twenty days

¹¹ Unpublished research, asking the same questions and receiving the same proportion of responses as the Soviet polls, from other communist countries revealed that the actual answers reflected more than a 50 per cent distortion of the truth. The response to a sensitive question indicated the respondent's distrust of promised anonymity.

¹² "The Younger Generation About Itself," Komsomolskaya Pravda (January 26, 1961), translated in The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, XIII, No. 15 (1961), pp. 15-25; "What Do You Think of Your Generation?," Komsomolskaya

the Institute had collected through the mail 19,000 responses, 1500 of which were disqualified for sundry reasons; the respondents were the youth aged fifteen to thirty who read Komsomolskaya Pravda. Komsomolskaya Pravda's circulation was 3,400,000 in 1960. Therefore one half of one percent of its readers answered the poll¹³ and of these, only 11 per cent (1933 out of 17,446) were from the countryside. Thus the overwhelming majority of answers came from city 'aktivists.' Furthermore not all the youth between fifteen and thirty have a subscription to Komsomolskaya Pravda. Like the first two polls, this poll "proved" that the overwhelming majority of the Soviet youth enthusiastically supports the regime.

Nonetheless, the replies indicated what is positively and negatively stressed in the society, and the open-ended question allowed for valuable self-criticisms. The editors themselves said that the "young generation cannot be accused of lacking self-criticism, for they speak out boldly about their shortcomings."

The questions on the strong traits of Soviet youth yielded predictable responses: love of homeland, patriotism, resoluteness, heroism, ~~manhood~~ and collectivism made up the list. The answers to the question, "Are there any negative characteristics common among young

Pravda (January 11, 1961), translated by The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, XIII, No. 2 (1961), pp. 32-34; "Confessions of a Generation," Komsomolskaya Pravda (July 21, 1961), translated in The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, XIII, No. 34 (1961), pp. 3-8; "Confessions of a Generation," Komsomolskaya Pravda (July 22, 1961), translated in The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, XIII, No. 35 (1961), pp. 11-15.

¹³ This is a good return in comparison with an American newspaper poll. Thus the volume of response to public

people?" were more varied. The number one target was drunkenness. The 'stilyagi' (literally, style monger) --their worship of foreign fashions, music, and dancing-- were the second target of the young generation according to the poll. Then came the complaints about time-wasters, the passive people, the parasites, the totally sex-occupied. A 29-year old chauffeur considered the desire to "stand out," to "make a better appearance than others" a negative trait. The over-all tone of the complaints leads to the conclusion that a negative characteristic is one which separates the individual--by his behavior and beliefs--from the group's or the whole society's accepted norms.

There was one notable exception to the favorable appraisal of the young generation. A 19-year old working woman from Moscow wrote the following: "The fact is that life is not very interesting. And this is not only my opinion but the opinion of the people I go around with. ...One feels a want of discipline and lack of culture in the behavior of young people. ...Money is everything. Luxury and well-being, love, happiness. You condemn those who do not work, who do nothing. Why, they are only to be envied, because they are enjoying life. We live only once!" Her letter sparked many denunciations from other youth, but there was also, carefully interspersed with criticism, some agreement with her views.

All of the polls, including the last two which were not tabulated for the public, have been reported in Komsomolskaya Pravda. The reports follow a common pattern.

opinion polls is similar although in the U.S. the polls are conducted by privately-controlled media and in the USSR, by government or party-controlled media.

Statistical and factual summaries are given at the beginning of the article; then the newspaper prints word for word answers of the informants. The editors make some kind of broad 'communist' generalization on the building of the society or on the specific questionnaire topic. Then the favorable replies to the question (i.e. those that parallel what is expected) are given. Following each reply there is editorial restatement of the principle or law behind the answer. Next come the unfavorable replies followed either by editorial criticism or a criticism by other respondents. Thus the party's view, as interpreted by a press that of course is an organ of the party, is presented to the people and is reinforced by continual repetition, by large generalizations of principles placed in capital letters, and by sweeping conclusions from the figures which, as we have seen, are not representative of an entire population.

Whatever the original purpose of the research was, the reports on the three analyzed polls document popular support of the Communist Party policy. Nevertheless the open-ended questions, consisting of about two-thirds of all the questions, do leave room for suggestions and free comments; and so variety, free expression, and criticism are possible. But how 'free' does the respondent feel to make suggestions contrary to the party line? After he has listed his age, sex, education, residence, occupation, does it really matter whether (and this question is optional) he supplies his name or remains "anonymous"?¹⁴

In June of 1961, after the results of the three polls

¹⁴ Here again, from unpublished research conducted in other communist countries, we see the distrust of anonymity and a distortion of the response.

had been published, a conference was held to discuss public opinion polling. (The third poll was omitted from the discussion.) Unlike most of the pollers, the critics were from academic institutions. A debate developed between B. Grushin of the Public Opinion Institute and F. D. Livshits, Candidate for the Academy of the Science of Economics. The former defended the 'open' question because it permits the best expression of opinions by the people, and the latter spoke in favor of the 'closed' question because the open question calls for long, complex answers which are difficult to classify for processing, whereas with the closed question the answers are differentiated and broken into previously determined headings. Stressing the importance of the choice of the subjects to be polled, Livshits condemned the poll on standard of living, saying that public opinion on this topic is unnecessary since the Central Statistical Directorate conducts budget research on this question. The other participants did not criticize the topics of the investigations, but they did attack the sampling procedure. A. G. Volkov of the Scientific Research Institute of Labor said that the respondents were not selected at random. V. D. Mirkin from the Central Statistical Directorate RSFSR, agreeing with Volkov, added that all levels of the population were not represented. All stressed the need for statistical aid in carrying out such public opinion research.¹⁵ The conference participants, viewing the results of the two polls, were mainly concerned, then, with open and closed questions, sampling methods, and the role of statistics. Perhaps their concern influenced the next three polls,

¹⁵ K., Vestnik Statistiki, No. 6, p. 5.

which were distributed to a larger number of people through Komsomolskaya Pravda itself and which contained open and closed questions, but the results of the last two were not publicized.

By June 1963 comment on the third poll was available. Candidate M. Kh. Igithkayan said, in Voprosy Filosofii, that although the organizers of the youth poll were not able to "typify" the composition of the questionnaire respondents in advance (N.B. This would lead to 'good' sampling!), the poll was nonetheless representative and characteristic of the Soviet youth. This, however, was as far as his praise for the polls went. He said that the Soviet researchers lacked knowledge on the subject of conducting public opinion polls and were ignorant of general statistical principles, concrete methods of typology, and tests for the reliability of the polls' results. He then went on to say that the poll conducted among readers of the press (and remember that the third, fourth, and fifth polls were conducted openly in the press whereas the first two were conducted by researchers) ascertained the opinion of isolated individuals, not collective opinion (i.e. productive, educational, and so on). Finally, he warned (and I dare say other researchers would agree) that neither a detailed elaboration of the methods of polling opinion nor the perfection of the techniques of analysis could by themselves ensure accuracy; that the results of a poll could reflect true public opinion only if along with provisions for representation in sampling and objectivity in analysis, the very subject of the poll was of interest to the polled group.¹⁶

¹⁶ Igithkayan, Voprosy Filosofii, No. 3, pp. 17-18.

Why do the Soviet researchers focus on the problem of sampling? Superficially, they might be concerned with representing the population fairly so that in a society of equals each will have an equal chance to be counted. However, the method of sampling and choosing those to be sampled has political significance. While conducting a poll, people with diverse opinions may be questioned and their replies recorded; but when making the data public, the researchers do not present all of the collected material although some acceptable "unfavorable" replies are published. Thus a representative total picture of Soviet society is not available.

What will happen with future Soviet empirical research is unknown. Hopefully, some bourgeois methods, such as sampling, will be adopted. Igithhayan's remark on the inaccuracies of current methodology is a promising sign.

TIME USE STUDIES

In 1960 we will complete the transfer of workers and employees to a 7-hour working day, while workers in the leading occupations in the coal and ore mining industries employed in underground work will be shifted to a 6-hour day. In 1962 workers and employees on a 7-hour working day will be transferred to a 40-hour working week. Beginning in 1964, workers and employees will be shifted to a 35-hour working week, while workers employed in underground jobs and other dangerous conditions will be shifted to a 30-hour working week. This means that with one day off each week the length of the working day will be either 5 or 6 hours, depending on the nature of the work. Or it will be possible to introduce a 5-day working week with a 6 or 7-hour working day and two days off each week.¹

Thus in 1960 the Soviets anticipated a reduction of the working day that would give the worker more free time. The problem of ascertaining how workers are utilizing this free time has become one of the Soviet's most voiced practical problems. If the state is to control the society, then the working people, and particularly the youth must "be shown" the correct and most rational way of utilizing free time. And they must not only be shown this, but the opportunities for utilizing free time in the proper manner must be made available by the community. At the same time, free time must become socially useful time, a time for increasing the productivity of labor and reproducing labor power.

¹N.P. Kostin, "Free Time Under Communism--Answers to Questions," Voprosy Filosofii, No. 5 (1960), translated in The Soviet Review, I, No. 1 (1960), p. 28.

The free-time problem has led to extensive "Time Budget" research. Contemporary time budget research is merely a continuation of an older Soviet tradition of time study research. The first workers' time budgets were studied by Academician Strumilin in the 1920's. One of the most influential contemporary time budget researchers, G. A. Prudensky, states that "aside from individual and insignificant efforts to work out time budgets for students and for some groups of social workers in 1930, and two or three selected studies of time budgets for workers and kolkhozniks in 1934-35, our statisticians did not do any research on time budgets of working people."² In the 60's the past studies are used to show the changes in the use of time, especially non-working time, as the society shifts from socialism to communism.

In the late 50's and early 60's time budget research was renewed with new effort and zeal. Perhaps this was due to the party's declaration of the transition from socialism to communism. Or perhaps, as the Soviets themselves state, they really did (and do) need to know how the people spent their time so that the planned society could in fact be a planned society and productivity could be increased. The 'Thaw' could also be a factor.

The researchers themselves state that the fundamental task of the investigation is to establish the facts on the use of working and non-working time. The results from

²G.A. Prudensky, "The Leisure Time of Working People in a Socialist Society," Kommunist, No. 15 (1960), translated by Joint Publication Research Service (Jan. 25, 1961), p. 10.

the survey of the time budgets are then to be used for planning and instituting a system of communally-provided amenities--trade, public catering bodies, cultural enlightenment work, sport facilities, and so on--for the rational use of non-working time, the improvement of life conditions, the further increase of the material and cultural-technical level of the workers.³ In addition the collected data should permit the researcher to characterize the conditions of the respondents' lives. (See sample time budgets in Appendices III and IV.)

Whatever the reason, 1958 ushered in many time use studies. In that year the Siberian Research Institute on Labor and Wages and the Siberian branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences launched a two-year research program on how non-working time was spent by workers in Siberia and the Urals. About 25,000 time budgets were collected and presented in about fifteen studies⁴ contained in one book, which is a summary of the materials of the investigations of the time budgets of workers, technical-engineering personnel, and white-collar workers in a number of industrial enterprises. I have used this publication as the basis of my inquiry into Soviet time budgets since it includes actual blank questionnaires and sets up the method of research used in later time budget studies. The editors state in the introduction, that the fundamental task of their investigation of time budgets consisted of working out recommendations for methodological practices in the study of non-working time; it

³ G. A. Prudensky, ed., Vnerabochee Vremya Trudyashchikhsya (Novosibirsk: Izdatelstvo Siberskovo Otdeleniya AN SSSR, 1961), p. 232.

⁴ Ibid., passim.

is necessary to regard the collection, they warn, only as a preparatory stage to the publication of further scientific works on the problem of free time.⁵

Each of the fifteen studies was conducted by different 'worker-collectives.' The authors were not only collaborators and teachers of the economic cadres of higher educational institutions of Siberia but also workers in the party, trade union, komsomol, and other organizations. In some cases the urban committee of the party guided the work; in others, students in the higher party schools aided researchers. Whatever the case, the research was a joint effort between practical workers from industry and social organizations and members from the Siberian Institute.

The survey method was used to investigate the use of time for workers for a period of twenty-four hours. The interviewing was conducted at the enterprise during non-working time or at home. The general information filled out by the registrar and the informant included the following: residence, location of work, sex, age, education, type of worker, wage category, fulfillment of norms, length of service, marital status, number of children, living conditions, and what appliances and similar things the family owned. In order to achieve accuracy the informant himself kept a diary of the use of his non-working time for the 24 hours. He was aided by the registrar as follows:

On the day of the preliminary talks with the person who is to be surveyed, the registrar must complete the general (information) part of the time budget form. The next day the registrar questions in detail the one who is being surveyed about the allocation of his time for the last 24

⁵Ibid., p. 4.

hours, and by these directed questions the registrar makes precise the separate uses of time. Writing down the amended answers of the respondent on a separate piece of paper and amending the auxiliary notes which were taken by the respondent himself, the registrar transfers them to a clean time budget blank, placing these answers in the corresponding boxes and lines.⁶

The data were collected and presented in the Siberian studies. Usually two variables were cross-tabulated, e.g., occupation and days, time categories and education, or use of time and two factories. The non-working time was divided into four categories and then subdivided: time spent in connection with work in industry, time spent for housework and self-service, time spent for physiological needs (sleep, nourishment), and free time. These four categories were in turn compared on a workday, a day-off, and a holiday. The analysis usually explained the peculiarities of the region or enterprise under investigation, presented the tables with comments, and discussed with criticisms and suggestions (sometimes they were direct party program quotations) the particular misuse or waste of time, especially time spent on housework and on getting to work. Mention was usually made of the change in the structure of non-working time by comparing the study to Strumilin's earlier ones. In general the conclusions said that there has been a quantitative increase in non-working time and a qualitative change in the use of time.

The most obvious flaw in the survey was in the method of sampling. No mention was made as to how people were chosen as respondents. Those who responded could not remain anonymous. Moreover, concerned with accurately recording time spent (the instructions advised no more

⁶Ibid., p. 233.

than a three- to five-minute leeway in accuracy), it is possible that, as in any diary method, the worker concentrated more on precisely filling out the time blank than on actually performing whatever he was doing. It is also possible that his time budget was influenced by his desire to indicate time spent on those things that the party, the komsomol, or the trade union stressed.

As in any interview research, the registrar, by his skillful questioning and prodding the interviewee, may have played a part in structuring the actual use of time. Moreover, the data do not take into account the position or status of the registrar, either of which may have affected the way the worker indicated how he had spent his time or the way that he modified this time use when speaking with the registrar.

The presentation of the material in the fifteen studies showed that many of the facts gathered were excluded from either the analysis or the graphs; much of the material was not correlated. Furthermore, no attempt was made to compare or contrast the findings in factories in different places. Nevertheless a careful examination of the single-volume collection of studies gives an interesting insight into a pioneer effort.

The study by V.D. Nikitin, secretary of the Kemerovsk 'obkom' CPSU, describes the use of productive time in the coal mining industry. He places primary emphasis on the technical processes of coal extraction and the time needed now to perform the relevant tasks. In the same vein, V.G. Kozhevnikov, first deputy chairman of the Kemerovsk 'sovnarkhoz', concentrates on the Kuznets and Kuzbass region, where the metallurgical combines are found. He compares production figures and growth of several factories in the economic region and describes the role

the 7-year plan plays in the economic process.

L.G. Golosov and I.V. Chernov, in their study of 26 factories in Leninsk-Kuznetsk, are primarily concerned with the time it takes for workers to travel to and from their homes to their jobs. "On the way from home to the mines and back again, miners on the average spend one hour and eighteen minutes, while workers in the factories and the plants take twelve minutes more."⁷ The authors suggest that free time will be utilized in a better fashion only when better transportation facilities exist. They state that as of now time is "irrationally spent on the way from the home to the working place, especially the time spent by underground workers." Transportation to the place of work for the underground worker must be decreased if these workers are to enjoy any free time, since it takes at least an additional hour to get to and from their actual site of work in the mine.

Other authors examine the use of time from different angles. V.K. Rozov, deputy director of the Sverdlovsk Higher Party Schools, concentrates in his three-page article on the growth of educational institutions and the numbers of workers attending such schools. R.P. Lamkov turns his attention to the time use of students in night schools. Another study, by L.I. Efremkov, concentrates on the preparation and price of food, as well as on how time is spent in children's clubs.

Some authors mention Strumilin's earlier time budget studies. D.F. Fedorov discusses the change in the use of free time between Strumilin's 1924 study and the 1959 Krasnoyarsk study. He notes that free time now is not spent on such foolish things as playing cards or attending

⁷ Ibid., p. 100.

religious services, and that the time spent in the pursuit of education has increased since the 1924 study. Another author, V.I. Bolgov, comparing the 1923-24 studies with those done in Novosibirsk in 1959, proudly shows how in 1923-24 men did twelve times as much reading as women, whereas in 1959 in Novosibirsk they spent only three times as much time on reading as the women. In another comparison he shows that in 1923-24 on a usual working day it took two hours and thirty-four minutes to prepare food, whereas in 1959 it took only one hour and thirty minutes; in other words, there was more than a 40 per cent decrease!

Most of the authors concur that housework is the biggest setback for the rational use of time. In the Novosibirsk study discussed by Bolgov women record three times as much time for housework as they do for free time. This irrational use of time prevents more women from joining the labor force. If we compare the time spent on housework for women in the 1924 Strumilin study with that spent in three Siberian communities, we learn that there has been little improvement. However, the division of the total time spent on housework is worth noticing.⁸

⁸ An absolute comparison of two studies in the Soviet Union is almost impossible since the categories are never held constant and often the figures are in uncomparable units. Moreover many numbers are not given; perhaps the Soviet researcher assumes they are unnecessary.

In the remaining parts of the text I refer to the Siberian study as the 1959 one, not because it is the median year of 1958 and 1960, but because Strumilin, writing in the Siberian book, uses this year to compare the 1924 figures with. Unfortunately, Strumilin gives us no indication of how he arrived at the Siberian figures. We must assume that they are the averages from the 15 studies. The 1924 figures have been verified and are cited in the bibliography of the charts.

The first striking fact is that the female workers in 1924 spent more than half of their time, whereas in the four Siberian regions the female workers average 24 per cent of housework time, for preparation of food. (See Table 1.) However, the 1924 study does not specify time for shopping. If we were to combine the 1959 categories of food preparation and shopping, and at the same time assume that food preparation in 1924 included shopping, we see that on the average the 1924 workers spent 13 per cent more time on food preparation than the 1959 Siberian workers. Of the remaining categories, the time spent on clothing is the only one in which as much difference as 5 per cent occurred between the 1924 and the 1959 women.

In 1961 the Laboratory of Sociological Studies of the Department of Philosophy of the Lenin State University conducted a study of time budgets of one hundred workers and office personnel of the Kirov plant in Leningrad, using the methods outlined by the Siberian studies.⁹ This time, however, some mention was made of the sampling method: "Inasmuch as the task before us was that of determining primarily the possibilities inherent in time budget analysis as a method, we sought to achieve maximum representation of various groups of working people in a sample of minimum size."¹⁰

In addition the people who were queried were selected on the 'voluntary' principle and were free not to state their names. As in the Siberian research, the subject was

⁹Beliaev, ed., Vestnik Leningradskovo Universiteta, Seriya Ekonomiki, Filosofii i Prava, No. 4, pp. 44-57.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 44.

TABLE 1
Structure of time for Housework by Women Workers,
in Per Cent

Type of Housework	1924	Stalinsk*		Krasnoyarsk	Dzerzhinsk
		Ordzhonikidze	KM Kombine		
Preparation of food	53.3	17.4	20.5	30.7	27.4
Shopping	---	12.2	13.8	14.1	13.7
(Food and shopping)	(53.3)	(29.6)	(34.3)	(44.8)	(51.1)
Care of clothing	15.0	18.6	14.8	14.3	23.9
Care of the house	8.3	12.4	14.1	13.4	13.1
Care of the children	11.0	13.7	13.4	14.1	10.1
Care of oneself	12.3	14.2	6.4	---	---
Other, including work on private economy.	---	11.2	17.0	13.4	11.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Per cent of total time spent on housework	20.0%	25.8%	19.7%	**	**

* The Stalinsk study was conducted in 3 enterprises in the city, reported in Prudensky, op.cit. One factory, named Kuznetskzhilstroï, in this study was eliminated because most of the workers were single.

** No per cent was given; however, it is noted that women in Dzerzhinsk spend one-third as much time on housework as do women in Krasnoyarsk.

asked to record how he spent his time, within a desired optimal accuracy of three to five minutes, starting at six a.m. The accuracy of the record kept was checked daily or every other day. The actual presentation of the data showed much improvement: the conclusions from the tables were sensible, conclusive, and meaningful, and the graphs were detailed and correlated many factors. (The Siberian studies usually correlated two variables only.)

Since the 1961 study little change has been made in the methods used in the published time budget studies of workers. The most recent one, conducted in 1962 by the Laboratory of Concrete Social Research in Kiev, follows the patterns first established in Siberia and amended by the Leningrad study.¹¹

The time budget studies for kolkhozes follow different patterns and allow for different factors. One such study was conducted on collective farms in two oblasts, Voronezh and Belgorod, the first with six districts and the second with eleven districts.¹² Seven-hundred-and-fifty questionnaires giving information on each family member (age, sex, education, etc.) and on how he spent time were filled out June to August 1960. Little information was included in the charts or in the analysis.

¹¹ M.P. Goncharenko et al., "Metodika i Nekotore Rezultati Konkretново Sotsialnovо Issledovaniya Byudzneta Vremeni Trudyashchikhsya," Nauchnie Doklady Vyshehei Shkoly. Filosofskie Nauki, No. 1 (1963), pp. 29-39.

¹² L. Lenkova, "The Use of Time by Collective Farmers," Ekonomika Selskogo Khozyaystva, No. 1 (1962), translated by Joint Publications Research Service, pp. 175-187.

All of the charts, however, compared the types of time expenditure among the four occupational categories of kolkhoz workers, divided into summer and winter work. Like the first Siberian studies, this study made no mention of sampling techniques.

The time budget study of collective farmers made in April of the same year showed marked improvement.¹³ The purpose of this study, conducted by the Scientific Research Institute of Labor, was to compare a progressive and a backward collective from each of the two provinces [the "Kirov" collective in Kherson Oblast in the Ukrainian SSR and the "Rodina" collective in the Altai Krai, RSFSR were the two progressive collectives; the "Novaya Zhizn" in the Kheisan Oblast and the "Zavedy Il'icha" in the Altai Krai were the two backward collectives] so as to determine the changing structure of the collective farmers' use of time, depending upon the prosperity of the collective and the presence of cultural and service establishments. On each kolkhoz the families investigated were selected with the objective of ensuring that they were typical and proportional in their representation of sex, age, income, and occupational composition. Following the method outlined in the Siberian studies, the registrar checked the entries recorded by the interviewer, seeing that there were no omissions, that the worker was not too general, and that the total of all time use equaled exactly twenty-four hours. If he discovered defects in the entries, the registrar asked questions to help the kolkhoznik under investigation

¹³ L. Bibik, "An Attempt to Study the Time Budget of Kolkhozniks," Byulleten Nauchnoi Informatsii: Trud i Zarabotnaya Plata, No. 6 (1961), translated by Joint Publications Research Service, pp. 185-200.

fill in the gaps or make the necessary correction. The novelty of this study lay in the statements by the researchers, informing the reader of the limits of the research and the representativeness of the study. "The data received from the investigation cannot be applied to all kolkhozniks in the country. Our investigation covered a relatively small number of persons (not over 500). In addition the data examined, pertaining only to one weekday and one free day taken at a certain season of the year, cannot fully reflect the true relationship in time expenditures for a longer period." The authors then offered suggestions for further time research: 1) carry out time budget studies in each period of the year, and do not restrict the investigation to kolkhozes in one zone; 2) compare time budgets of kolkhoz and sovkhov workers; 3) use time budgets when planning the development of social and cultural measures in the village; 4) work out measures to improve the structure of time for all the kolkhozniks and for the individual groups --by sex, occupation, etc.

The Soviets themselves have not analyzed comparatively the findings of the Strumilin, the Siberian, the Leningrad, and the Kiev studies, nor have they analyzed the results of the kolkhoz studies in terms of the 1934-35 studies.

The salient fact to keep in mind in considering the various studies is the difference between urban and less-developed or industrialized areas. The 1924 Strumilin study interviewed 625 people, of whom 9 per cent came from Moscow, 6 per cent from Leningrad, and the remaining 85 per cent from the provinces, people who lived near the factories and the large towns and hence can be characterized as urban. This is not true for the Siberian studies.

Strumilin himself, writing in the 1959 Siberian book, is quick to point to the consequences of the differences between the more industrially developed area of Moscow and Leningrad and the Siberian area, where mining plays as great a role as manufacturing--if not a greater one. In other words, there are differences in occupational levels as well as in the availability of goods and services in the areas. Strumilin notes that Siberians as compared with residents of Moscow and Leningrad, spend much less time on cultural activity and a greater part of time on traveling to the place of work. Therefore geographical factors must be considered in our comparisons.

The data from Table 2 show the total daily expenditure of time for the male workers in the four studies. The first two columns are presented in the 1959 Siberian study. No significant decrease in productive time is evident. However, the Soviet comments along with this table lead the reader to the conclusion that there has been a considerable increase in non-working time for the worker since 1923-24. The actual figures and the written explanation do not correspond. Moreover the Siberian worker, who now spends almost twice as much time on work connected with his job than he did in 1924 and the same amount of time for housework, actually has not more but less free time. When we consider the Leningrad and Kiev studies, the picture is altered. The men in these two studies spend less time at their jobs, and a much greater percentage of their time is free. Of the four studies, the Siberian workers spend the most time on work connected with their job, but the time connected with the job has, in comparison with the Strumilin study, increased for both the Leningrad and Kiev workers. The Leningrad figures were given for the average week. From those

TABLE 2
General Structure of Average Daily Time for Male Workers,
in Per Cent

Use of Time	1924	1959 Siberia	1961 Leningrad	1963 Kiev
Work in production	34.5	33.1	26.3 [30.6]	25.5
Work connected with job (transportation to and from, etc.)	4.9	9.6	6.3 [7.3]	6.2
Housework	7.2	7.1	5.5	4.7
Physiological needs (sleep, eating)	38.7	36.1	36.5	38.8
Free time	14.7	14.1	25.4	24.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number in the sample	625*	**	71	101

* 625 includes men and women.

** Not available.

figures it is possible to determine the average daily per cent of time spent at work and time connected with work. (These figures are included in parentheses in the tables.) But it is impossible to obtain the average daily per cent for the other categories because the weekly figure includes the rest day. This accounts for some of the differences. Nevertheless, judging from the figures in parentheses for time spent at work and time connected with work, it would seem that the remaining per cent of time use for the Leningrad workers falls more evenly between the 1959 Siberian study and the 1963 Kiev study than the weekly figures would have us believe.

The data from Table 3 show the percentage division for an average working day for women in the four studies. Again, the first two columns are presented in the 1959 Siberian book, and the tables and the commentary arrive at different conclusions. The time spent on work connected with the job has increased. Like the men, the Siberian women workers spend more time than the workers in the other regions on work connected with their job. But there has also been a slight increase in free time. The women from Leningrad and Kiev have considerably more free time and less work time than the women in 1924 and those in Siberia.

The Kolkhozniks' average work day is different from that of blue-collar and white-collar workers. (See Table 4.) The 1934 Strumilin kolkhoz study interviewed 1867 men and 2234 women from seven Soviet oblasts, notably from Moscow and Belorussian areas. The findings from this study may be compared with the 1960 data from the Voronezh and Belgorod oblasts. At first glance it is evident that time spent working on the collective has increased with the exception of the field workers. "The growth of expenditures

TABLE 3
General Structure of Average Daily Time for Female Workers,

in Per Cent

Use of Time	1924	1959	1961	1963
		Siberia	Leningrad	Kiev
Work in production	34.2	32.5	24.0 [28.0]	25.1
Work connected with job (transportation to and from, etc.)	4.4	8.1	6.1 [7.1]	5.0
Housework	20.0	16.2	13.1	14.0
Physiological needs (sleep, eating)	33.8	32.9	34.9	38.9
Free time	7.6	10.0	21.9	17.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number in the sample	625*	**	29	241

* 625 includes men and women.

** Not available.

TABLE 4

General Structure of Average Daily Time for Kolkhoz Workers,

in Per Cent

Use of time	1934	1960	
		Field-workers	Livestock Machine Operators
Productive labor on kolkhoz and MTS**	31.7	22.6	35.0
Productive labor on private plot	1.2	8.4***	4.8
Service labor in household	1.5	15.6	9.3
Transportation to work and other economic necessities	4.0	2.2	3.9
Care of oneself	8.7	8.9	7.4
Sleep	40.5	30.7	26.7
Free Time, of which	11.7	11.6	12.9
Study & self-education	5.3	---	---
Part in public activity	1.4	---	---
Entertainment, sport, & leisure	4.5	---	---
Other	0.5	---	---
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

* Figures originally given in total annual time

** This figure includes productive labor on the kolkhoz, MTS, and other productive labor. 27.4 per cent is amount for work on kolkhoz and MTS alone in the 1934 study.

*** See text for explanation.

of collective farmers' time in the collective economy of the collective farms in 1960 as compared with 1934 is explained by the development and strengthening of the collectivized economy of the collective farms."¹⁴ The workers of the 1960 study are divided into field workers, livestock workers, and machine operators. The chart indicates that the livestock workers and machine operators spend the greatest share of time in collective farm production: this is "explained by their longer working day as well as by better, more organized use of their labor during the year. They are employed more than the others in collective production, and they devote less time to productive labor on the personal plot and on service and household labor."¹⁵ There is thus a noticeable difference in time use between the three types of workers. Like the worker studies previously cited, there has been no increase in free time.

Conclusions from the proportional use of free time are harder to draw than those from the actual use of the 24-hour day because no two studies consistently divided the free time into similar categories. (See Tables 5 and 6.) For example, one study included time spent with children as leisure time, while another added inactive rest, which could mean anything from sleeping to doing nothing. Nevertheless, some points are relevant. With Soviet emphasis on education, we would expect to see a

¹⁴ Lenkova, Ekonomika Selskogo Khozyayastva, No. 1, p. 185.

¹⁵ Seasonal variation has not been considered. Also, the 1960 figures included men and women, and the majority of women work as field workers; this accounts for the large per cent of time spent on housework and service labor. (See Ibid., p. 187.) The 1934 figures are for male workers.

TABLE 5
General Structure of Free Time of Male Workers,
in Per Cent

Use of Free Time	1924	Siberia	Leningrad	Kiev
Public and cultural activity	6.8	1.1	5.6	5.3
Study, lectures, self-education	10.4	11.3	16.9	18.1
Passive leisure--walking, going to parks, having guests	17.5	15.5	17.1	20.6
Cultural leisure--TV, radio, theatre, movies	2.6	24.1	20.8	20.0
Reading	28.1	22.2	14.9	15.9
Busy with children	---	---	5.0	12.0
Amateur work, physical culture, sport, and	1.8	5.5	3.4	} both 8.1
Other (table games, hobbies)	3.4	2.2	5.5	
Inactive rest	27.5	13.3	6.1	---
Not accounted for	1.9	5.7	3.7	---
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 6
General Structure of Free Time of Female Workers,

in Per Cent

Use of Free Time	1924	Siberia	Leningrad	Kiev
Public and cultural activity	7.6	2.6	6.5	5.3
Study, lectures, self-education	10.0	15.1	21.9	15.9
Passive leisure--walking, going to parks, having guests	27.0	17.7	20.3	24.9
Cultural leisure--TV, radio, theatre, movies	3.5	28.4	28.3	24.9
Reading	13.3	16.4	23.8	11.4
Busy with children	---	---	5.4	13.1
Amateur work, physical culture, sport, and	1.0	1.6	2.8	both 4.5
Other (table games, hobbies)	1.4	1.1	2.0	
Inactive rest	31.9	10.0	4.7	---
Not accounted for	4.3	7.0	4.3	---
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

sizable increase since 1924 in free time devoted to study. Taking the Strumilin study as the base, it is evident that such time has increased up to 8 percentage points for the male workers in Kiev, but as little as nine-tenths of a percentage point in Siberia. Women's time devoted to education has increased more substantially: it has increased one and a half times in Siberia and doubled for women in Kiev. The Siberian study indicates for both men and women the least amount of time spent on public and cultural activity, but this is probably due to the ambiguity of the term. The most striking change between the 1924 and the recent studies is the time allocated to 'cultural leisure' or time for TV, radio, theatre, and movies. Taking into consideration the current development of radio, TV, and the movies, the growth is still impressive and indicative of the Soviet emphasis on the use of mass communications as the media for reaching the greatest number of people. The time spent reading for men has declined since 1924, whereas this same time has increased, with the exception of Kiev, for women.

The use of free time for kolkhozniks varies slightly from that of workers, but sometimes the results are reversed (see Table 7). The 1960 study of four collectives, two progressive and two backward, is the study compared with the 1934 collective study. Men on these kolkhozes now spend more time reading and studying than they did in 1934, but women spend much less time than they formerly did. For both sexes, time for public work has declined, but here again the definition of the term could be the determining factor. The same noticeable increase in time spent for entertainment, sport, and leisure occurs for both men and women on the present kolkhozes, but exact

TABLE 7
General Structure of Free Time for Kolkhoz Workers,

in Per Cent

Uses of Free Time	Male		Female	
	1934	1960	1934	1960
<u>Reading and study,</u>	44.9	47.1	29.2	17.5
Training and self-education	---	15.8	---	4.3
Reading books, newspapers	---	31.3	---	13.2
<u>Public work</u>	11.6	1.3	4.4	2.9
<u>Entertainment, sport, leisure,</u>	37.5	50.5	35.8	79.6
Radio and TV	---	11.3	---	16.4
Guests	---	10.8	---	35.5
Games and entertainment	---	7.2	---	8.7
Movies and clubs	---	21.2	---	19.0
<u>Religious culture and other spiritual requirements</u>	5.9	1.1	30.6	---
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note: Figures for 1934 were given for the general categories but were not broken down as were the 1960 figures.

comparisons are impossible since the 1934 study does not separate these three factors. The final category of time points to the decline of religious activities, although the empty column for women, or the great drop from 30.6 per cent to 0.0 per cent again indicates terminology difficulties.

One further chart for free time use, prepared by the Higher Party School in Krasnoyarsk, is of more than routine interest, for it is the only available chart from all the time budget studies which correlates time use with income (see Table 8). As could be expected, the higher the income, the greater the amount of free time. The worker with the highest income devotes more time to study, attending lectures, and going to museums than do the other workers. In fact, the difference between the lowest-paid worker and the highest in this category is startling. The highest-paid worker also spends the least amount of time on inactive leisure; again there is a great difference between the high and low. It is surprising to note that in proportion to total time tourism increases but slightly with income, although the percentage change between the highest and lowest is significant. The category also includes walking, and it is possible that the worker with the lowest income walks to the exclusion of touring during his vacation time whereas the worker with the highest income spends that time traveling. In the remaining categories--cultural leisure and other relaxation--there is no significant difference in the use of time between workers of different incomes.

Much Soviet time budget research is available; the Siberian effort was an excellent beginning. Moreover the actual time budget research accounts contain less Soviet propaganda than other sociological research; the

TABLE 8

Free Time of Workers in 1960 in Krasnoyarsk, by Income,

in Per Cent

(Classification by income for one member of a family in the former scale of rubles)

Types of Free Time	Income in Rubles			
	Up to 300	301-500	501-1000	1000 up
I. Physical development	11.5	6.8	7.4	8.1
Physical culture and sport	8.0	3.4	2.2	3.1
Walking, tourism	3.5	3.4	5.2	5.0
II. Cultural activity	24.4	31.5	39.4	47.4
Public service	.5	1.3	2.3	2.2
Study, attending lectures, museums	4.5	10.6	14.5	23.8
Reading	18.9	19.2	21.9	20.1
Amateur art work	.5	.4	.7	1.3
III. Cultural leisure	24.3	26.4	27.5	23.5
Movies, theatre, other	23.4	25.1	25.6	21.9
Home games, chess	1.5	1.3	1.8	1.6
IV. Other relaxation	16.9	18.3	16.6	15.4
Visiting, having guests	11.4	11.9	10.0	9.1
Other time losses	5.5	6.4	6.6	6.3
V. Inactive leisure	22.3	17.0	9.2	5.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Per Cent of total year's time	12.1%	14.2%	16.1%	19.2%

proportion of concrete data to propaganda is large. The results of the research should also have important implications for planning purposes. For these reasons, the time budget studies are, in the author's opinion, the most significant sociological research performed in the Soviet Union.

CONCLUSIONS

Sociology in the Soviet Union is coming of age. The ratio of the empirical to the theoretical studies is gradually increasing as the theoretical works themselves lay more and more stress on the importance of research. Even the bourgeois sociologists are not held in as much contempt as they were in the late fifties, for the Soviet researchers are slowly realizing and acknowledging the fact that some bourgeois methods are not only good but are also applicable and adaptable to Soviet research although bourgeois sociology still is presented as a mere reflection of capitalist interests. The most promising sign observed is actual criticism of research (but not theory), the slight beginning of dissent, and the suggestions for improving research among the Soviet sociologists.

Soviet self-criticism focuses mainly on the fact that the discoveries of sociological research are not applied because specialists in other areas (technology and mathematics, for example) remain ignorant of them. The constant cry is for social scientists to work together and with scientists from other fields. Sociologists complain that once the research is done, recommendations based on their findings are not put into practice soon enough. Another complaint is that experimentation is usually rare, and the testing of new proposals in practice is not extensively used.¹ Gapochka and others vehemently

¹Gapochka et. al., Voprosy Filosofii, No. 1, p. 131.

challenge the sociologists because they "are little concerned with the application of their recommendations, even if they have such recommendations."²

What is to be done in sociology? Soviet sociologists offer several suggestions. First, since the sociologists are confronted with the task of training scientific cadres to carry out concrete sociological research, they suggest holding seminars and lectures for teachers in the institutions of higher learning on the subject of social statistics, social psychology, and the methods and techniques of applied social research. Second, they stress the needed increase in the preparation and publication of books about the above subjects, including sociological statistics, social psychology, sociological research methods and techniques, criticism of bourgeois sociology, and, above all, books which from a sociological viewpoint generalize the experience of communist construction. Third, they state the necessity of systematic conferences and meetings to discuss completed research and the strengthening and development of contacts with the Central Statistical Administration, Gosplan, the State Economics Council, and other institutions.³ Fourth, they have recommended the creation of a special sociological center assigned to work out the methodology of applied sociological research. Connected with this is Olshansky's suggestion to publish a special sociological journal designed to acquaint the public with the results and methods of the best research in the Soviet Union and in other socialist

²Ibid., p. 132.

³These suggestions all come from Osipov et al., Nauchnie Dopolady Vysshei Shkoly: Filosofskie Nauki, No. 5, pp. 14-15.

countries.⁴ The most ambitious suggestion, offered at the Stresa Conference in 1959 by President Frantsev of the Soviet Sociological Association--that of acquiring an Institute in the Academy of Sciences--has so far come to naught.⁵

If the Soviet sociologists are allowed to carry out their program for their discipline and thus widen the sphere of activity, then sociology will undoubtedly expand in the Soviet Union. Unfortunately such an expansion is not equivalent to liberalization or progress. Soviet research is intended to uphold dogma, not to verify hypotheses. Thus an unbiased evaluation has less to do with the fact that Soviet sociologists use a Marxist interpretation than with the fact that Soviet theories serve to predict future action and, at the same time, to instruct such action. Added to this is the lack of objectivity in Soviet sociology where the conclusions from observations are not independent of the values or beliefs of the researcher.

The Western sociologist examining Soviet research also finds it hard to forget that it is not divorced from, but tempered by, political considerations. Political control over research determines the subjects to be studied and the results to be presented. It does not permit free choice or open dissent.

⁴Olshansky, Partiinaya Zhizn, No. 15, p. 9.

⁵Labeledz, Soviet Survey, No. 31, p. 26.

ANNOTATED
BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Aseev, Yu. A. and Kon, I. S. Osnovnie napravleniya Burzhuaznoi Filosofii i Sotsiologii XX Veka. (Fundamental tendencies of Bourgeois philosophy and sociology of the 20th Century.) Leningrad: Izdatelstvo Leningradskovo Universiteta, 1961. Pp. 105. (5500 copies.)

The second part of this book, entitled "The Fundamental Direction of Present-day Bourgeois Sociology," was more relevant than the first section on bourgeois philosophy. The characteristics of bourgeois sociology were stated and the conclusion drawn that bourgeois sociology was the ideological weapon of imperialism. The book was helpful primarily as background material.

Bukharin, Nikolai. Historical Materialism: A System of Sociology. 4th ed. New York: International Publishers, 1933. Pp. xv and 311.

Bukharin was one of the first Soviet theoreticians to discuss sociology as a legitimate study for other scientists. He concentrates on theory, dealing with such subjects as society, social law, historical materialism, sociology as social science and history, and the differences between bourgeois sociology and Marxist sociology.

Fischer, George. Science and Politics: The New Sociology in the Soviet Union. Ithaca, New York: Center for International Studies, Cornell University, 1963. Pp. 66.

Fischer's new monograph is the most recent and comprehensive study of the state of Soviet sociology. Supplemented by visits to the USSR and personal encounters with sociologists, his account focuses on sociology as a 'sociology of work' and also on the link between sociology, as science, and politics.

Prudensky, G.A. (ed.) Vnerabochee Vremya Trud'yashchikhsya. (Non-Working Time of Workers.) Novosibirsk: Izdatelstvo Sibirskogo Otdeleniya AN SSSR, 1961. Pp. 254. (1000 copies.)

The Soviets and I used this collection of the 1958 - 60 Siberian time budget studies as the standard time budget study upon which to base further research

Rozhin, V.P. (ed.) Voprosy Marksistskoi Sotsiologii: Trudy Sotsiologicheskovo Seminara. (Questions of Marxist Sociology: The Work of the sociology seminar.) Leningrad: Izdatelstvo Leningradskovo Universiteta, 1962. Pp. 140. (3500 copies.)

This book, a result of the Leningrad Seminar, is a collection of essays on the following subjects: Marxist sociology, IV World Congress of Sociology, questions about present-day bourgeois sociology, the cultural-technical level of the working class, crime, social psychology and marriage and the family. It served mainly as a general picture of Soviet sociological thought.

Strumilin, S.G. Problemy Ekonomiki Truda. (Problems of Economic Work.) Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatelstvo Politicheskoi Literatury, 1957. Pp. 733. (10,000 copies.)

Strumilin describes the methods and the results of his time budget studies on workers, peasants, and kolkhozniks. The charts are quite detailed and most useful for comparison.

----- Rabochii Den i Kommunizm. (The Working Day and Communism.) Moscow: Izdatelstvo V Ts. S P S Profizdat, 1959. Pp. 64. (15,000 copies.)

Here Strumilin's charts summarize the findings presented in Problemy Ekonomiki Truda.

MAGAZINES

Balagushkin, Ye. G. "Stroitelstvo kommunizma i pazvitie brachnosemeinykh otnoshenii," ("Building communism and the development of the marriage-family relation") Voprosy Filosofii, No. 3 (1962), pp. 31-38.

I used this article for the basis of my discussion of the family. The author emphasizes the growth and change of the family structure as the material-technical base of communism is strengthened.

Beliaev, E.V. et al. "Workers' Time-Budget Research: A Method of Concrete Sociological Investigation," Vestnik Leningradskogo Universiteta, Seriya Ekonomiki, Filosofii i Prava, No. 4 (1961), translated in Soviet Sociology, I, No. 4 (Summer, 1962), 44-57.

This is an excellent study by the Leningrad Philosophy Department on the use of workers' time. It is one of the first modern studies to follow the Siberian Institute's method of research. The charts are particularly outstanding.

Bibik, L. "An Attempt to Study the Time Budget of Kolkhozniks," Byulleten Nauchnoy Informatsii: Trud i Zarabotnaya Plata, No. 6 (1961), translated in Joint Publications Research Service (n.d.), pp. 185-200.

The Scientific Research Institute of Labor conducted this time budget study of Kolkhozniks. Its best asset, besides discussing the method of inquiry, is the qualifying statements of the authors who suggest that the data is not applicable to all kolkhozy.

Bocharov, Yu. P. and Rabinovich, V.I. "Stroitelstvo Kommunizma i Problemi Razvitiya Nashikh Gorodov," ("Building Communism and the problems of developing our cities") Voprosy Filosofii, No. 2 (1962), pp. 25-36.

My data on urban development comes from this article. The authors discuss the principles of socialist population settlement and suggest ways for further developing Soviet towns.

Boldyrev, Yevgeni, "The Study and Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency," Sovetskoe Gosudarstvo i Pravo, No. 12 (1960), translated in The Soviet Review, II, No. 5 (May, 1961), pp. 20-27.

This article, taken from a law journal, presents the findings of several Soviet investigations of juvenile delinquency and reveals the manner in which law-enforcement agencies enlist the efforts of Soviet citizens in meeting this problem.

Bolgov, V. and Chernov, I. "Svobodnoe vremya trudyashchikhsya v usloviyakh sokrashchennovo rabochevo dnya," ("Free time of workers in the conditions of a shorter working day") Voprosy Ekonomiki, No. 2 (1961), pp. 158-160.

This article reports what was discussed at the 1960 Stalinsk conference on free time. It notes the influence on the use of free time by the shock brigades.

Chrina, L.P. "Provishenie kulturno-tekhnicheskovo urovnya trudyashchikhsya," ("Increasing the cultural and technical level of the workers") Voprosy Filosofii, No. 8 (1961), pp. 153-156.

Chrina describes the tasks of the conference, held in Sverdlovsk, in January, 1961, which reviewed research done in specific fields. He also spoke of the task of researchers, but this discussion was mainly propaganda.

Feuer, Lewis S. "Meeting with Philosophers," Survey, No. 51 (April, 1964), pp. 10-23.

Feuer describes his encounters with Soviet philosophers and sociologists on his last trip to the Soviet Union. His account is both interesting and informative, especially on the topic of 'protivism.'

Gapochka, M.P., Karpenko, O.M., and Kuftin, E.I. "Stroitelstvo kommunizma i zadachi obshchestvennikh nauk," (Building communism and the tasks of social science) Voprosy Filosofii, No. 1 (1963), pp. 128-138.

In the abstract, the authors discuss the work of various departments of the social sciences and relate the CPSU program for the development of the social sciences. It is the job of the social sciences to help in building communism.

Goncharenko, M.P. et al. "Metodika i nekotore rezultati konkretnovo sotsialnovo issledovaniya byudzhete vremeni trudyashchikhsya," ("The methods and several results of concrete social research of the time budgets of workers") Nauchnie Dokladi Visshei Shkoli: Filosofskie Nauki, No. 1 (1963), pp. 29-39.

The 'author-collective' acquaints the reader with the most recently-conducted time budget study. The well-described and well-conducted study indicates that time budget research is gradually being carried out in areas other than Moscow, Leningrad and Siberia.

Igitkhanyan, M. Kh. "The Spiritual Image of Soviet Youth," Voprosy Filosofii, No. 6 (1963), translated in The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, XV, No. 39 (Oct. 23, 1963), pp. 16-18.

Igitkhanyan constructively criticizes the Public Opinion Institute's third poll ("Confessions of a Generation") and, at the same time, mentions the validity and methodology of polling. In his appraisal, he particularly stresses the composition of the respondents.

Iovchuk, M.T. and Osipov, G.V. "On Some Theoretical Principles, Problems and Methods of Sociological Research," Voprosy Filosofii, No. 12 (1963), translated in Current Digest of the Soviet Press, XV, No. 6 (1963), pp. 15-18.

The history of Soviet sociology since the Great October Revolution is reported in this article. Discrediting bourgeois sociological research, the authors discuss the problems and methods of Soviet research.

K. Yu. "In the Statistical Section of the Moscow House of Scholars," Vestnik Statistiki, No. 6 (1961), translated in Joint Publications Research Service (n.d.), pp. 1-6.

K. considers the purpose of and the subject matter of Komsomolskaya Pravda's three polls. He also relates the proceedings of the public opinion polling conference at which methods were criticized and suggestions offered for furthering the accuracy of the polls.

Kammari, M.D. "The Revisionist Myth Concerning the 'Liberation of Science from Ideology.'" Voprosy Filosofii, No. 7 (1958), translated in Joint Publications Research Service (May 15, 1959), pp. 1-24.

The author vehemently attacks a 'revisionist' article in a Polish magazine which first advocates the separation of Marxist social science and Marxist sociology and then wants to separate science and ideology. While refuting the Polish article, Kammari offers his and the Party's thoughts on the subject.

Karavaev, G.G. "Historical Materialism and Concrete Research in Sociology," Vestnik Leningradskogo Universiteta, Seriya Ekonomiki, Filosofii i Prava, No. 11 (1962), translated in Soviet Sociology, I, No. 2 (Fall, 1962), pp. 3-9.

Although not actually cited in the text, this article was most helpful in structuring my thinking on the relationship between sociology and historical materialism. The writer believes that historical materialism is the philosophical and theoretical basis for scientific sociology.

Kolbanovskii, V.V. and Slesarev, G.A. "Obshchee sobranie sovetskoi sotsiologicheskoi assotsiatsii," ("The General Meeting of the Soviet Sociological Association") Voprosy Filosofii, No. 5 (1961), pp. 150-154.

These authors summarized the activities of the Soviet Sociological Association and explained the proposal for the V World Congress of Sociology. They suggest that sociology contribute to society.

Komsomolskaya Pravda: "Komsomolskaya Pravda's Public Opinion Institute," Komsomolskaya Pravda (May 19, 1960), translated in The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, XII, No. 20 (1960), pp. 24-29; "How has your Living Standard Changed?," Komsomolskaya Pravda (Oct. 7, 1960), translated in The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, XII, No. 41 (1960), pp. 9-18; "The Younger Generation about Itself," Komsomolskaya Pravda (Jan. 26, 1961), translated in The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, XIII, No. 15, (1961), pp. 15-25; "What do you think of your Generation?," Komsomolskaya Pravda (Jan. 11, 1961), translated in The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, XIII, No. 2 (1961), pp. 32-34; "Confessions of a Generation,"

Komsomolskaya Pravda (July 21, 1961), translated in The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, XIII, No. 34 (1961), pp. 3-8; "Confessions of a Generation," Komsomolskaya Pravda (July 22, 1961), translated in The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, XIII, No. 35 (1961), pp. 11-15; "What do you think of the Young Family?," Komsomolskaya Pravda (Dec. 17, 1962), translated in The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, XIV, No. 9 (1962), pp. 17-19; "How do you spend your Free Time?," Komsomolskaya Pravda (Jan. 11, 1963), translated in The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, XV, No. 7 (1963), pp. 12-14.

In these articles, the editors of Komsomolskaya Pravda present and analyze Komsomolskaya Pravda's Public Opinion Institute's five polls. I based my criticism of public opinion polling on these sources.

Kostin, N.P. "Free Time Under Communism - Answers to Questions," Voprosy Filosofii, No. 5 (1960), translated in The Soviet Review, I, No. 1 (1960), pp. 27-36.

With the reduction of the working day increasing attention has been focused on the use of leisure time. This article points out the major activities which will occupy people's free time in the communist society of the future.

Krupyanskaya, V. Yu. "K voprosu o problematike i metodike etnograficheskovo izucheniya sovetskovo rabochevo klassa," ("Toward the question of the problems and methods of ethnographical study of the Soviet working class") Voprosy Istorii, No. 11 (1960), pp. 40-49.

Krupyanskaya describes the role of ethnographic studies and shows how these studies are used for family research. Not satisfied with the ethnographic research to date, he advises further improvements.

Kudryatsev, V.D. "Book Review: Topics of Scientific Research Works in Siberia and the Far East, 1959 - 65. Social Sciences," Izvestiya Siberskogo Otdeleniya Akademii Nauk SSSR, No. 6 (1960), translated in Joint Research Publications Service (Sept. 7, 1961), pp. 1-8.

Kudryatsev reviews research in process at Siberian institutions. At the same time, he complains that work is duplicated because there is no coordination or cooperation between these institutions.

Labedz, Leopold. "Sociologists in Conference: The Spirit of Stresa," Soviet Survey, No. 31 (1960), pp. 20 - 29.

Labedz, editor of Soviet Survey, describes his impressions of the Soviet delegates at the IV World Congress of Sociology held in Stresa in 1959. He notes the changes in the composition of the delegates from the 1956 Congress and tells of their status in the academic community in the USSR; he also suggests the problems of sociology as a discipline. His is a personal description.

----- "Sociology as a Vocation," Survey, No. 48 (1963), pp. 57-65.

Labedz's commentary on the state of sociology in the USSR was one of the first. With insight, he pictures sociologists he has known and summarizes what has been happening in Soviet sociology in the 1960's. His conclusion emphasizes the role of the Party as the determining factor for future sociology.

Lenkova, L. "The Use of Time by Collective Farmers," Ekonomika Selskogo Khozyaystva, No. 1 (1962), translated in Joint Publications Research Service (n.d.), pp. 175-187.

The use of time by collective farmers employed in crop production, livestock raising, machine operations, administration and service is the subject of this paper. Conducted in 1960, the study is one of the first of the modern collective farm studies.

Lunghi, Hugh. "Opinion Probe in Russia," European Service General News Talk (May 26, 1960), pp. 1-4.

One week after Komsomolskaya Pravda announced the opening of its Public Opinion Institute, Lunghi presented a Western view of the first poll. I used one section of this talk (see text).

Maslov, P.P. "Modelling in Sociological Research," Voprosy Filosofii, No. 3 (1962), translated in Joint Research Publications Service (May 7, 1962), pp. 1-29.

Maslov defines a 'sociological' investigation and indicates methods for this type of research. He concentrates on the model--its use, application, principles, and values. By laying a theoretical basis for modelling, Maslov will (hopefully) influence future research.

Olshansky, V. "Rely on Applied Sociological Research," Partiinaya Zhizn, No. 15 (1963), translated in The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, XV, No. 33 (1963), pp. 7-9.

The first and only study to mention students as sociologists also explores the role of sociology and the Party. Olshansky further examines the methodology of questionnaires and offers a plan for a new sociology center. This is a most encouraging article for the future of Soviet sociology.

"On the Work of a Sociology Seminar," Vestnik Leningradskogo Universiteta Seriya Ekonomiki, Filosofii i Prava, No. 1 (1960), translated in The Soviet Review, I, No. 1 (1960), pp. 62-63.

Sociology is not taught as a distinct discipline in Soviet universities. This note from a Leningrad University Journal suggests increasing interest in this field by Soviet scholars.

Osipov, G.V. "Some Characteristics and Features of 20th Century Bourgeois Sociology," Voprosy Filosofii, No. 8 (1962), translated in The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, XIV, No. 42 (1962), pp. 8-12.

In this article, Osipov presents a lengthy discussion and dissection of bourgeois sociology and its emphasis on the social group. At the same time he suggests adapting some bourgeois methods to Marxist sociology.

Osipov, G.V. et al. "Marxist Sociology and its Sociological Research," Nauchnye Doklady Vysshei Shkoly: Filosofskie Nauki, No. (1962), translated by Joint Publications Research Service (March 25, 1963), pp. 1-16.

The authors express the view that concrete research today helps to study general historical laws, to discover new ones, and to correct and accelerate communist construction. Methods and techniques of sociological research are discussed, stressing the need for the study of mass phenomena.

Osipov, G. and Yovchuk, M. "Some Principles of Theory, Problems and Methods of Research in Sociology in the USSR," read at the V World Congress of Sociology in Washington, D.C., 1962, American Sociological Review, XXVIII, No. 4 (1963), pp. 620-623.

Distinguishing between Marxist sociology and bourgeois sociology, Osipov and Yovchuk consider the uses of sociological research as they tell where such research is conducted. Specifically, they discuss the validity of polling and suggest that there are many problems yet to be solved.

Pogosyan, Ervand. "Social and Cultural Problems in Contemporary Neo-Freudianism," Vestnik Istori Mirovoy Kultury, No. 3 (1961), translated in The Soviet Review, III, No. 4 (1962), pp. 16-32.

This is an examination of the social aspects of psychoanalytic theory and its influence on contemporary Western thought, notably on sociology and modern culture.

Popova, I.M. "K Voprosu o sotsialnoi poche psikhologizma v burzhuanznoi sotsiologii," ("Toward the question of the social growth of psychologism and bourgeois sociology") Voprosy Filosofii, No. 3 (1961), pp. 86-96.

Popova denounces the contemporary psychologism in bourgeois sociology. Such social-psychological conceptions of society correspond to the interests of the contemporary bourgeoisie. The article reads like a page from a Party textbook.

----- "Social Psychology in American Sociology," Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta, Seria Ekonomiki, Filosofii i Prava, No. 5 (1960), translated in The Soviet Review, II, No. 8 (1961), pp. 3-19.

A Soviet scientist analyzes the emergence within the past half century of social psychology and psychological approaches in sociology as disciplines typical of Western philosophical interpretation. A contrast is made between this and the Marxist appraisal of social phenomena.

"Problems of Social Sciences Development Under Conditions of the Extensive Building of Communism," Vestnik Akademii Nauk SSSR, XXII, No. 12 (1962), translated in Joint Publications Research Service (Feb. 28, 1963), pp. 1-10.

In purely propaganda terms, the author shows how the social sciences are building communism and helping the Party. The future development of the social sciences and the link between social sciences and Marxism-Leninism are fully explored.

Rutkevich, M.N. and Kogan, L.N. "Methods of Sociological Study of Specific Phenomena," Voprosy Filosofii, No. 3 (1961), translated in The Soviet Review, III, No. 11 (1962), pp. 3-20.

This paper presents a Marxist definition of sociology and an evaluation of various methods of sociological research. It was an invaluable guide to the theoretical aspects of Soviet sociology.

Semyonov, Nikolai, "Science and Society in the Atomic Age," Voprosy Filosofii, No. 7 (1960), translated in The Soviet Review, II, No. 3 (1961), pp. 34-48.

A leading Soviet physicist and Nobel Prize winner (1956) discusses the present role and the potential of science in our highly complex mechanized age, as well as the role, position and responsibility of the individual scientist, under both capitalism and socialism.

Semyonov, V.S. "Na V Vsemirnom sotsiologicheskome Kongresse," ("On the Fifth World Sociological Congress") Voprosy Filosofii, No. 11 (1962), pp. 19-35.

Semyonov, a delegate to the V World Congress of Sociology, recounts the topics and proceedings of this conference. He of course praises the Soviet contributions while challenging bourgeois theory and research.

Suslov, M.A. "XXII Sezd KPSS i zadachi kafedr obshchestvennykh nauk," ("The 22nd Congress of the CPSU and the Tasks of the Departments of Social Sciences") Kommunist, No. 3 (1962), pp. 15-46.

This author examines the role of various social sciences. He lists what economists, historians, and philosophers have published in 1956-60, and stresses the important role of journals.

Udelov, A.K. "Public Opinion as a Subject of Sociological Research," Voprosy Filosofii, No. 3 (1959), translated by Joint Publications Research Service (Aug. 9, 1962), pp. 1-37.

The main theme of this article is that public opinion under capitalism differs from public opinion under socialism where there is one unified public opinion. Udelov is adamantly anti-random sampling.

"V Poiskakh Sotsiologicheskoi Teorii," ("In Search of Sociological Theory") Kommunist, No. 2 (1963), pp. 93-103.

Besides reviewing the proceedings of the V World Congress, this article lists the participants and their academic backgrounds. This, then, started me on my investigation of these delegates.

Additional Bibliography

Books

Kritika sovremennoi burzhuaznoi filosofii i sotsiologii
(Criticism of present-day Bourgeois Philosophy and Sociology). Moscow: Izdatelstvo VPSi i AON pri TsK KPSS, 1961. Pp. 270.

Rozhin, V.P. Vvedenie v marksistskiiu sotsiologiiu
(An introduction to Marxist Sociology). Leningrad: Izdatelstvo Leningradskovo Universiteta, 1962. Pp. 158.

Magazines

Ananov, V.S., and Larionov, M.P. "Predmet i metodi sotsiologicheskovo issledovaniya" (The subject and methods of sociological research), Nauchnie Doklady Vysshei Shkoly: Filosofskie Nauki, No. 2 (1963), pp. 124-131.

Bibik, L. and Markovich, M. "Changes Occurring in the Structure of Free Time," Politicheskoe Samoobrazovanie, No. 7 (1962), translated in Soviet Sociolog I, No.2 (Fall, 1962), pp. 38-40.

Konstantinov, F.V. "Sotsiologiya i Politika," Voprosy Filosofii, No. 11 (1962), pp. 3-18.

Maslov, P. "Vnerabochee Vremya v usloviyakh perekhoda ot sotsializma k kommunizmu" (Non-working time under the conditions of the transition from socialism to communism), Voprosy ekonomiki, No. 12 (1961), pp. 59-70.

Prudensky, G. "The Leisure Time of Working People in a Socialist Society," Kommunist, No. 15 (1960), pp. 40-48, translated by Joint Publications Research Service (Jan. 25, 1961), pp. 1-11.

Udelov, A.K. "Socialism and Public Opinion," Voprosy Filosofii, No. 6 (1960), pp. 31-42, translated in Joint Publications Research Service (Aug. 9, 1962), pp. 38-75.

Bibliography for Stratification

1. Shtraks, G.M. "O Razvitii Obektivnykh Zakonov," (About the Development of Objective Laws), Voprosy Filosofii, No. 7 (1961), pp. 62-72.
2. "Stroitel'stvo Kommunizma i Voprosy Ideologicheskovo Vospitaniya," (The Building of Communism and Questions of Ideological Education), Kommunist, No. 17 (1958), pp. 1-16.
3. Timofeyevski, A.A. "Prinsipi estestvennogo razvitiya i ukrepleniya KPSS" (Principles of the Natural Development and Strengthening of the CPSU), Voprosy Istorii, No. 4 (1958), pp. 37-57.
4. Boyarski, A. Ya. "O tak nazivaemon 'sotsialnom mobilitom'" (On So-called "Social Mobility"), Voprosy Filosofii, No. 5 (1958), pp. 64-73.
5. Semenov, V.S. "O klassakh i klassovoi borbe v sovremennykh kapitalisticheskikh stranakh" (About classes and the class struggle in contemporary capitalist society), Voprosy Filosofii, No. 5 (1960), pp. 112-123.
6. Kammari, M.D. "Revizionistskii mif o 'Osvobozhdenie' Nauki iz Ideologii" (The Revisionist Myth concerning the "Liberation" of Science from Ideology), Voprosy Filosofii, No. 7 (1958), pp. 3-19.
7. Glezerman, G.E. "Ot klassovoi differentsiatsii k sotsialnoi odnorodnosti" (Evolution from class differentiation to Social Homogeneity), Voprosy Filosofii, No. 2 (1963), pp. 39-49.
8. Kurilev, A.K. "O vsestoronnem razvitii lichnosti pri kommunizme" (About the all-round development of the individual under communism), Voprosy Filosofii, No. 11 (1961), pp. 29-41.
9. Golota, A.I., and Korolev, B.I. "Sotsialnaya priroda sovetskoi intelligentsii" (The Social Nature of the Soviet Intelligentsia), Voprosy Filosofii, No. 10 (1961), pp. 58-69.

10. Golota, A. and Korolev, B. "Sovetskaya intelligentsiya v period razvernutovo stroitelstva kommunizma" (The Soviet Intelligentsia in the period of full-scale building of communism), Kommunist, No. 10 (1967), pp. 15-25.
11. Shemenev, G.I. "Inzhenerno-tehnicheskaya intelligentsiya v period razvernutovo stroitelstva kommunizma" (The Engineering and Technical Intelligentsia in the period of the full-scale Construction of Communism), Voprosy Filosofii, No. 8 (1960), pp. 25-34.
12. Mokponosov, G.V. "Stiranie Sotsialnykh Granei mezhdyy Rabochim klassom i Intelligentsiei v period razvernutovo stroitelstva kommunizma" (Elimination of Social Boundaries between working class and intelligentsia in the period of the full-scale building of communism), Nauchnye Doklady Vysshei Shkoly: Filosofskie Nauki, No. 3 (1967), pp. 18-30.
13. Andreeva, G.M. "Automatizatsiya proizvodstva i stiranje sotsialnykh granei mezhdyy rabochim klassom i inzhenerno-tehnicheskoi intelligentsiei" (Automating Production and the Abolition of Social Boundaries between the Working Class and the Engineering and Technical Intelligentsia), Nauchnye Doklady Vysshei Shkoly: Filosofskie Nauki, No. 4 (1961), pp. 24-33.
14. "Klass, stoyashchii v tsentre sovremennoi epokhi" (Class, Standing at the Centre of the Present Epoch), Kommunist, No. 7 (1963), pp. 12-21.
15. Kim, M.P., and Senyavskii, S.L. "Rost Rabochevo Klassa SSSR v 1953 - 1961 gg." (Growth of the Working Class in the USSR for 1953 - 1961), Voprosy Istorii, No. 3 (1963), pp. 3-21.
16. Aitov, N.A. "Stiranie razlichii mezhdyy krestyanstvom i rabochim klassom v bitu i kulture v period razvernutovo stroitelstva kommunizma" (The elimination of the Differences between the Peasantry and the Working Class in home life and culture in the period of the full-scale building of communism), Voprosy Filosofii, No. 12 (1961), pp. 102-112.

17. Manevich, E.L. "O likvidatsii razlichii mezhdu umstvennim i fizicheskim trudom v period razvernutovo stroitelstva kommunizma" (The abolition of the differences between mental and physical labor in the period of the full-scale building of communism), Voprosy Filosofii, No. 9 (1961), pp. 15-23.
18. Kurylyev, A.K. "Zadacha stiraniya razlichie mezhdu gorodom i derevnei" (The problem of overcoming the essential difference between Town and Countryside), Voprosy Filosofii, No. 4 (1959), pp. 32-43.

Appendix I

The Soviet Delegates - Their Writing Magazine Articles in 1962^b

Participants^a

Books in 1962^c

G.M. Andreeva^{*}

Bourgeois Empirical Sociology
in search of an exit from crisis

Ye.A. Arab-Ogly^{*}

Confusion in the cosmos (Notes
on sociology and present-day
fantasy literature and the West)

Ye. A. Bagranov^{*}

International Congress of
Sociologists

Without Ideals
(Bourgeois Ideology)

G.E. Glezerman^{**}

Problems of Historical Materi-
alism in the lights of the Program
of the CPSU.
Communism and Public Progress.

Communism and Labor
Fundamental Marxist
Philosophy¹
Questions of theory
and practice of com-
munist education

N.I. Grashchenkov^{***}

Several articles on medicine and
biology

One book on medicine

D.V. Ermolenko^{*}

Yu.A. Zamoshkin^{*}

A.A. Zvorikin^{**}

Production strength of communism
Society and the scientific mechan-
ican revolution

History of mechanics

Participants

M.T. Iovchuk ***

F.V. Konstantinov ***

K.S. Kyznetsova *

A.D. Makarov **

A.N. Maslin **

A.F. Okulov **

Magazine Articles in 1962

The final stage of the great cultural revolution in the USSR
Present stage of communist development and several actual problems of philosophical science

Dissident, anti-Marxist activity of Albanian leadership

Unification of mental and physical labor - one of the important tasks of building communism
International culture of communism

Several questions on the development of Soviet Philosophy after the 20th Congress of the CPSU

Books in 1962

V.I. Lenin on the nature of knowledge and practice

Fundamental Marxist Philosophy¹

Historical-philosophical introduction to the course of Dialectical and Historical Materialism

Man to man - the friend
Dialectical materialism

Outlook of the working class: Lectures of Dialectical Materialism.

ParticipantsG.V. Osipov^{*}Magazine Articles in 1962

Unification of mental and physical
labor - the important tasks of
building communism²
On the scope of the life of the
people
Marxist sociology and the place in
it of concrete sociological re-
search
Several limits and peculiarities
of bourgeois sociology in the 20th
century

Books in 1962V.S. Semenov^{*}

Classes and the
class struggle in
present-day bour-
geois society
The latest received
defenses of the old
world (peace)

Ts.A. Stepanyan^{**}

Fundamental laws of the building
of communism
About the object of the course
of "The Fundamentals of scientific
communism"

V.A. Shteinberg^{**}

<u>Participants</u>	<u>Affiliation of the participants</u>
G.M. Andreeva	Moscow University (Philosophy Institute)
Ye. A. Arab-Ogly	Moscow
Ye.A. Bagranov	Moscow University (Philosophy Institute)
G.E. Glezerman	Moscow: Academy of Social Science, attached to CC of the CPSU
N.I. Grashchenkov	
D.V. Ermolenko	Moscow
Yu. A. Zamoshkin	Moscow University (Philosophy Institute)
A.A. Zvorikin	Moscow University (Philosophy Institute)
M.T. Iovchuck	Ural University (Now chief editor of <u>Filosofskie Nauki in Moscow</u>)
F.V. Konstantinov	Moscow: Director, AS USSR (Philosophy Institute)
K.S. Kuznetsova	Moscow State University (Dept. of Philosophy)
A.D. Makarov	Higher Party School, attached to CC of CPSU; Dept. of Dial. and Historical Materialism: Moscow.
A.N. Maslin	Moscow University (Philosophy Institute)
A.F. Okulov	Moscow: AS USSR (Philosophy Institute)
G.V. Osipov	Moscow University (Philosophy Institute)
V.S. Semenov	Moscow University (Philosophy Institute)
Ts.A. Stepanyan	Moscow: AS USSR (Philosophy Institute)
V.A. Shteinberg	Riga

Notes to Appendix I

Key: Academic Rank - Highest 1st

- *** Member-correspondent of the USSR Academy of Sciences
- ** Doctor of Science (highest academic degree, roughly equivalent to D. Litt., D.Sc.)
- * Candidate of Science (holder of the degree of Candidate, a first post-graduate degree, roughly equivalent to M.A., M.Sc.)

¹ Book written together

² Magazine article written together

^a "V Poiskakh Sotsiologicheskoi Teorii," Kommunist, No. 2 (1963), p. 95.

^b Titles found in Letopis Zhurnalnikh Statei (Moscow: Izdatelstvo Vsesoyuznoi Knizhnoi Palati, 1962), Nos. 1-52.

^c Titles found in Knizhnaya Letopis (Moscow: Izdatelstvo Vsesoyuznoi Knizhnoi Palati, 1962), Nos 1-52.

Appendix IIPublic Opinion Questions

- I. What do Soviet people think? How do they view the present correlation of the forces of peace and war?
 1. Will mankind succeed in averting a war?
(Yes or No.)
 2. On what do you base your belief?
 3. What must be done above all to strengthen peace?
- II. How has your living standard changed?
 1. Has your living standard changed in recent years?
(Risen, remained the same, declined.)
 2. In what way? To what do you chiefly attribute this?
 3. Which do you consider most urgent (underscore):
reduction of the working day, increase in the output of consumer goods, housing construction, improvement in services, increase in food output, higher wages, enlargement of the number of children's institutions?
 4. What do you suggest for the quickest solution of the problem you have indicated above?
- III. Younger Generation about itself.
 1. What do you think of your generation? Does it please you, and are you satisfied with its goals? (Yes or No.)
 2. On what do you base your opinion?
 3. In your opinion, what traits are the strongest in Soviet young people? Where are they most clearly in evidence?

4. In your opinion, are there any negative characteristics common among young people? If your answer is yes, what are they?
5. What justification do you have for your opinion?
6. Which of the following is, in your opinion, more typical of young people (underline one): Purposefulness, a lack of goals?
7. Do you have a personal goal in life? (yes, no, have not thought about it.)
8. What is it?
9. What must you do to achieve it?
10. What have you already done?
11. Do you think you will achieve this goal? (Yes, no, don't know).
12. On what do you base your certainty?

IV. What do you think of the young family?

1. In your opinion, what are the strongest traits characterizing the Soviet family?
2. What do you value most in your own family?
3. From what still-existing survivals of the past, in your opinion, is it necessary for young families to free themselves?
4. What features in the upbringing of children in the Soviet family do you consider the best and most advanced?
5. In your opinion, what difficulties in the upbringing of children do families encounter at the present time?
6. What ways would you suggest for overcoming these difficulties?

7. Which of the following would be the most important in eliminating the vestiges of woman's inferior position in everyday life?
(Underline)
8. In your opinion, how well prepared are young married people to create a family? How does a lack of preparation manifest itself?
9. In your opinion, is the existing marriage procedure in need of changes? If so, what changes?
10. Is the existing procedure for the annulment of marriages in need of changes? If so, what changes?
11. How do you explain the break-up of young families?
12. What measures can you suggest for strengthening the young family?

V. How do you spend your free time?

1. How much time, on the average, do you spend each day on the following:
 - a. Your chief work (in the case of students, your studies).
 - b. Supplementary work to earn money.
 - c. In transit from home to place of work (each way).
 - d. Everyday needs (housework, shopping for food and other items, making use of communal and service institutions, etc.)
 - e. Evening or extension study at educational institutions.
 - f. Care of children.
 - g. Sleep.
2. What do you do with the remaining free time (how much time do you give to volunteer work, reading, sports, etc.; how often do you go to the movies, the theater, sports events, etc.)?
3. What do you do on your day off?

4. What would you like most of all to do with your free time?
5. What keeps you from spending your free time as you would like to?
6. What are the most important ways you see for making better use of leisure time?

Appendix IIITime Budget Blank for Workers and Office Workers

I. General information about the respondent and his family.

Data from the inquiry ____ Number of budget ____

Shift - day, evening, night

1. Republic, krai, oblast

City, working community

Branch of industry

2. Where he works (name of enterprise, institution, organization).

3. Sex

4. Age

5. Education:

Up to third grade

Elementary

Seventh year

General secondary school

Special secondary school

College, incomplete

College

6. Where one studies:

At a daily educational institution

At a night educational institution

By correspondence education

Refresher courses and schools of progressive methods

Other forms of education (university of culture, etc.)

8. For non-workers, indicate the source of his means of subsistence:

Pension

Stipend

Dependent on others

Other sources of his means of subsistence

9. Wage category (for worker), number of grades in the wage categories.

10. Average percent of fulfilling production norms (for piece-work) during the past month:

up to 100%

100-105%

105-110%

110-125%

125% and more

11. Overall length of service,
including a specialty

12. Extra wages for the past month.

13. Total daily income, on the average, for or member of the family for ____ month, 196__.

14. Of all the members of the family

Of those:

Workers

Housewives

Pensioners (non-workers)

Children:

up to one year old

from one to six

from seven to eleven

adolescents from 12 to 15

other members of the family

15. Number of children found in children's institutions

Of these:

In kindergardens and nurseries

In schools (including schools which stay
open late)

In boarding schools

16. Size of the living space on the average for one member
of the family

17. Family occupies (figures encompass the family circle)

Flat

One room apartment

Two or more rooms in an apartment

Portion of rooms

Dormitory

Private house

Private flat

18. Presence in the flat of communal comforts (figures
encompass the family circle)

Central heating

Oven heat

Sewage

Water supply system

Hot water

Baths and showers

Refuse disposal

Gas

19. Presence in the family of cultural-domestic inventory (figures encompass the family circle)

Sewing machine

Washing machine

Refrigerator

Vacuum cleaner

Radio receiver

Television

Bicycle

Motorcycle, scooter

Private passenger car

20. Use of the enterprise's public feeding facilities by members of the family

Regularly 2 or 3 times a day

Regularly once a day

Every now and then

21. Number of books in personal library

Literary

Specialist

Political

Appendix IVDistribution of Time - Sample Time Budget

Different Time Expenditures	Working Days	Rest Day
<hr/>		
I. Working time		
Time for actual work (contracted)		
Time for actual work (over-time)		
Delays and non-productive working time		
Regulated breaks in work (industrial gymnastics, time for nursing mothers, etc.)		
II. Non-working time, connected with work in production		
Eating		
Waiting in line in the dining room or buffet		
Leaving and entering the dining room or buffet		
Rest and other time expenditures		
Time to take care of oneself before and after the shift (dressing, changing, washing)		
Walking to and from the station or stop of trans- portation		
Waiting for transportation		
Riding to work and back		
Walking to work and back		

III. Housework

Shopping - not for food

Time on the way to and from the store

Staying in the store (without waiting in line)

Waiting in line

Shopping for food

Time on the way to and from the store

Staying in the store (without waiting in line)

Waiting in line

Time shopping in the market place (excluding travel to and from)

Food preparation

Light the stove, carry the ashes, get the firewood

Carry the water

Preparing or warming up the dinner, lunch or breakfast

Washing the dishes (after having all the food for the day)

Care of the house and furniture

Tidying up the house

Tidying up the yard

Repairing furniture, etc. and other work of taking care of the house

Care of clothing

Washing, ironing (besides swaddling clothes)

Repairing shoes and clothing

Cleaning clothes

Visiting the laundry

Visiting the repair shop, the clothes cleaners
and the shoe repairers

Visiting the store to repair furniture and
daily apparatus

Visiting the dress-makers and the tailors

Visiting the loaning or hiring point

Looking after the children

Taking care of the unweaned babies, day and
night

Washing, feeding, dressing the unweaned
children

Taking the children to the kindergarten,
the school

Visiting the children in the hospital and in
consultation

Work in subsidiary economy

(Taking care of cattle, birds, gardens and
vegetable gardens)

Other types of housework

Knitting, sewing, manufacturing domestic
articles

Storing up coal

Other types of housework

IV. Looking after oneself

Dressing, washing, combing one's hair and shaving at home

Washing at home

Time for medical treatment at home

Time waiting at a medical institution

Reception time at the physician's

Time on the way to the bath and the shower and back again

Waiting in line at the bath and the shower

Using the bath and the shower

Time on the way to the hairdresser and back again

Waiting in line at the hairdresser

Time for unsatisfactory service at the hairdresser

V. Physiological time

Time for food

Time expended on eating at home

Time on the way to the dining room, the café, the teahouse and back again

Waiting in line at a dining room, the café and the teahouse

Time for eating in the dining room, the café and the teahouse

Sleep

Sleeping during the day

Sleeping at night

VI. Free Time

Children's education

Checking the school tasks, part in preparing the children's lessons, reading, conversations and instructions on difficult habits

Walking and playing with the children

Visiting gatherings of relatives, meeting with teachers

Study and improving skill

Preparation for studying and reading special literature at home and in a library

Studies in educational institutions (schools, technicums, institutes, etc.) without time on the way

Studies in industrial-technical courses, in schools of progressive methods, and on dress-making courses (without time on the way)

Time on the way to institutions, courses, reading rooms and libraries

Studies on the Party system of enlightenment

Public or social work

Preparation and reading of lectures, reports on the system of Party enlightenment, industrial and technical courses, schools of progressive methods

Part in meetings, sessions, conferences, etc.

Part in mass Sunday work

Fulfillment of other public drafts

Creative activity and amateur work

Inventions and rationalizations

Literary creativity, painting, sculpting

Part in artistic self-activity

Photography, radio amateurism

Other types of amateur work

Physical Culture and sport

Physical exercises, besides at production

Amateur occupation with sports and sporting games (volleyball, football, skating)

Occupation in athletic schools and sections, part in competition

Rest and entertainment

Reading newspapers

Reading magazines and creative literature

Attending lectures and reports

Listening to the radio

Looking at programs on television

Going to the movies

Going to the theater

Going to concert halls, clubs, houses of culture

Going to museums and exhibitions

Going to parks, gardens, stadiums, walking without children

Singing, playing on musical instruments at home

House table games (dominoes, chess, checkers, lotto, cards, etc.)

Receiving guests and visiting relatives and friends

Inactive leisure

Other types of rest

VII. Other time expenditures

Visiting institutions for personal business (savings banks, post office, etc.)

Unallocated time

TOTAL

Unclassified

Security Classification

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R&D

(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)

1 ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author) Massachusetts Inst. of Tech., Cambridge. Center For International Studies		2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified	
		2b. GROUP	
3 REPORT TITLE SOVIET SOCIOLOGY: 1960-1963			
4 DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates) Research-monograph			
5 AUTHOR(S) (Last name, first name, initial) Weinberg, Elizabeth A.			
6 REPORT DATE October 1964		7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES 110	7b. NO. OF REFS 94
8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO. AF 49(638)-1237		9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) C/64-30 #14	
b. PROJECT NO. ARPA #920F-9717 c. 61445014 d. 681313		9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report) AFOSR 67-0958	
10 AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES Requesters may obtain copies of this report from the Center for International Studies Library at MIT. Distribution of this document is unlimited			
11 SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES <i>Tech Other</i>		12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY Air Force Office of Scientific Research (SRLB)	
13 ABSTRACT As Soviet sociology matures as a discipline, it becomes more receptive to Western scholarship, making increasing use of Western techniques and adapting them to Soviet research theory. According to Soviet scholars in the field, the main problem is a lack of coordination of research and poor communication among the various scholars and institutes engaged in research of a sociological nature. Lack of publishing facilities and inhibitions against experimentation also constitute difficulties, and remedies are suggested for their resolution. The author adds her own evaluation of the state of Soviet sociology. She especially points to the lack of objectivity resulting from political considerations which precludes free choice and open dissent. (u)			

DD FORM 1473
1 JAN 64

Security Classification

14 KEY WORDS	LINK A		LINK B		LINK C	
	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT
Public opinion polls						
Time Use studies						
Empirical research						
Dialectical and historical materialism						
"Bourgeois" sociology						
Marxist sociology						
Institute of Ethnography, USSR Academy of Sciences						
Institute of Philosophy, USSR Academy of Sciences						
Voprosy Filozofii						
Work in production/productive labor						
Physiological needs						
Study and self-improvement						
Cultural leisure						
Inactive rest, passive leisure						
Self-criticism						

INSTRUCTIONS

1. **ORIGINATING ACTIVITY:** Enter the name and address of the contractor, subcontractor, grantee, Department of Defense activity or other organization (corporate author) issuing the report.

2a. **REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION:** Enter the overall security classification of the report. Indicate whether "Restricted Data" is included. Marking is to be in accordance with appropriate security regulations.

2b. **GROUP:** Automatic downgrading is specified in DoD Directive 5200.10 and Armed Forces Industrial Manual. Enter the group number. Also, when applicable, show that optional markings have been used for Group 3 and Group 4 as authorized.

3. **REPORT TITLE:** Enter the complete report title in all capital letters. Titles in all cases should be unclassified. If a meaningful title cannot be selected without classification, show title classification in all capitals in parentheses immediately following the title.

4. **DESCRIPTIVE NOTES:** If appropriate, enter the type of report, e.g., interim, progress, summary, annual, or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered.

5. **AUTHOR(S):** Enter the name(s) of author(s) as shown on or in the report. Enter last name, first name, middle initial. If military, show rank and branch of service. The name of the principal author is an absolute minimum requirement.

6. **REPORT DATE:** Enter the date of the report as day, month, year; or month, year. If more than one date appears on the report, use date of publication.

7a. **TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES:** The total page count should follow normal pagination procedures, i.e., enter the number of pages containing information.

7b. **NUMBER OF REFERENCES:** Enter the total number of references cited in the report.

8a. **CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER:** If appropriate, enter the applicable number of the contract or grant under which the report was written.

8b, 8c, & 8d. **PROJECT NUMBER:** Enter the appropriate military department identification, such as project number, subproject number, system numbers, task number, etc.

9a. **ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S):** Enter the official report number by which the document will be identified and controlled by the originating activity. This number must be unique to this report.

9b. **OTHER REPORT NUMBER(S):** If the report has been assigned any other report numbers (either by the originator or by the sponsor), also enter this number(s).

10. **AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES:** Enter any limitations on further dissemination of the report, other than those

imposed by security classification, using standard statements such as:

- (1) "Qualified requesters may obtain copies of this report from DDC."
- (2) "Foreign announcement and dissemination of this report by DDC is not authorized."
- (3) "U. S. Government agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified DDC users shall request through _____."
- (4) "U. S. military agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified users shall request through _____."
- (5) "All distribution of this report is controlled. Qualified DDC users shall request through _____."

If the report has been furnished to the Office of Technical Services, Department of Commerce, for sale to the public, indicate this fact and enter the price, if known.

11. **SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES:** Use for additional explanatory notes.

12. **SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY:** Enter the name of the departmental project office or laboratory sponsoring (paying for) the research and development. Include address.

13. **ABSTRACT:** Enter an abstract giving a brief and factual summary of the document indicative of the report, even though it may also appear elsewhere in the body of the technical report. If additional space is required, a continuation sheet shall be attached.

It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified reports be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall end with an indication of the military security classification of the information in the paragraph, represented as (TS), (S), (C), or (U).

There is no limitation on the length of the abstract. However, the suggested length is from 150 to 225 words.

14. **KEY WORDS:** Key words are technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a report and may be used as index entries for cataloging the report. Key words must be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location, may be used as key words but will be followed by an indication of technical context. The assignment of links, rules, and weights is optional.